FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Supplement

Soviet Union

Regional Affairs
RSFSR

FBIS-SOV-90-241-S
Friday
14 December 1990

Soviet Union
SUPPLEMENT
Regional Affairs
RSFSR

FBIS-SOV-90-241-S CONTENTS *14 December 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Prime Minister Silayev Arrives in Stuttgart 1
  On Official Visit *[TASS]* 1
  Silayev, Baden's Spaeth Comment *[TASS]* 1
  Agriculture Discussed *[TASS]* 1
  Receives Truck Donation *[TASS]* 2
  Meets Chancellor Kohl *[TASS]* 2
  Kohl on Role of Ethnic Germans *[DPA]* 3
Chamber Chairmen on Supreme Soviet's Work *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Dec]* 4
Silayev on Reforms, Possible Conflicts *[MOSCOW NEWS No 45]* 7
RSFSR Resolution on State Management of Economy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 9
Dissemination of Constitution Draft Scored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 9
Ministry To Run Space Communications System *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Nov]* 10
RSFSR Deputy Ethics Commission Chief Named *[Moscow Radio]* 11
RSFSR Minister Views Media Plans *[Moscow Radio]* 11
RSFSR Legislators Adopt State Pensions Law *[TASS]* 11
Deputies Criticize Draft Constitution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 11
Khasbulatov Defends Russia's Defiant Stance *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 13
RSFSR Draft Constitutions Compared *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 9 Dec]* 16
RSFSR Politburo Issues Appeal to Citizens *[SOVESKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Nov]* 20
RSFSR Communist Party Joint Plenum Meets 21
  Paper Reports Speeches *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Nov]* 21
  Commissions Established *[PRAVDA 21 Nov]* 34
  Resolution Adopted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Nov]* 35
  Polozkov Holds News Conference *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 36
CP Central Control Commission Holds Plenum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Nov]* 36
Communist Party's Ilin on Party Policy *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 37
RSFSR Congress Agenda Changes Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Nov]* 41
'Communists of Russia' Hold News Conference *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Dec]* 41
  PRAVDA Report *[6 Dec]* 42
Russian Republican Party Congress Detailed *[Moscow Radio]* 43
  Leader Summarizes Position *[Moscow Radio]* 44
  Shostakovskiy on New Party *[SOYUZ No 47]* 44
Russian Democratic Party Publishes Newspaper *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Russian Foreign Trade Bank To Open Jan 1991 *[IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]* 46
Ivashko Addresses Party Secretaries in Obninsk *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Dec]* 46
Ivashko Meets With Kaluga Communists *[Moscow TV]* 47
Journalists Congress Discusses Union Rules, Aims *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 47
  Congress Ends; Leader Elected *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 48
Russian Afghan War Veterans Set Up Union *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Nov]* 48
Confederation of Deported Nations Formed *[TASS]* 48
Polish-Russian Friendship Declaration *[Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA 13 Nov]* 49
RSFSR Textile Industry Strike Threat Viewed *[TRUD 21 Nov]* 50
Russian Textile Workers Union Demands Action *[TASS]* 50
New Journal Published in Russia *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Deputies Confer on Russia-Estonia Treaty *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 51
Moscow Food Crisis Blamed on Mismanagement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Dec]* 51
Polozkov Meets With Moscow Rayon Aktiv *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Dec]* 52
Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum Held 5 Dec *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Dec]* 52

Moscow Gorkom Party Conference Resumes 29 Nov 52
    Prokofyev Speaks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov]* 52
    Debate Reported *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 53
    IZVESTIYA on Prokofyev Report *[30 Nov]* 54
'Special Situation' Imposed on Moscow Trade *[IZVESTIYA 29 Nov]* 55
Moscow City Soviet Registers New Publication *[IZVESTIYA 30 Nov]* 56
Moscow Party Leader Views Future of Communists *[Vienna VOLKSSTIMME 2-3 Dec]* 56
Prokofyev Interviewed on Market Transition *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Moscow Soviet Discusses Housing Privatization *[IZVESTIYA 20 Nov]* 58
Gidaspov Addresses CPSU Leningrad Aktiv *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 59
Leningrad Oblast, City Differ Over Militia Chief *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 61
Two Incumbents Confirmed for Same Leningrad Post *[PRAVDA 15 Nov]* 61
Gidaspov Holds News Conference 28 Nov *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 61
Explosion Damages Tomsk Refinery *[Moscow TV]* 62
Local Media Hit Over Bashkir Refinery Incident *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* 62
Komi ASSR Forms Joint-Stock Company *[Moscow Radio]* 62
Karelian Transport Problems Reported *[PRAVDA 30 Nov]* 63
Kemerovo Oblast Moves Toward Civil Accord *[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]* 64
Deutsche Welle Broadcasts Shown in Volgograd *[Moscow TV]* 65
Tver Peasant Party Branch, New Bank Created *[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]* 65
Newsprint Shortage Hits Some Sakhalin Papers *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 66
Khanty-Mansiysk Rejects Sovereignty Declaration *[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]* 66
Cherepovets Rations Additional Food Items *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Tatar Democratic, Front Offices Ransacked *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Gorno-Altay Communists Back Stabilization *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 30 Nov]* 68
Semenov Elected Kaliningrad First Secretary *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Perm Oblast Conference Ends; Obkom Chief Elected *[PRAVDA 25 Nov]* 69
RSFSR's Adyge Obkom Elects New First Secretary *[PRAVDA 29 Nov]* 69
Three Ballots Needed To Elect Omsk Obkom Chief *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 69
Ponomarev Elected Belgorod First Secretary *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 69
Oblast Soviet Votes Party Leader Out of Chair *[PRAVDA 13 Nov]* 70
Far Eastern Oblasts Coordinate Activity *[LESNAYA GAZETA 22 Nov]* 70
Don Cossacks Elect Mikhail Sholokhov as Hetman *[PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 70
Potapov Elected Head of Buryat Party Committee *[PRAVDA 17 Nov]* 71
Buryat-Mongol People's Party Constituted *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 71
Dagestan Faces Complex Sovereignty Issue *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 20 Nov]* 71
Volgograd Foreign Currency Speculators Tried *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 72
Crimean Tatars Resettlement Committee Formed *[TASS]* 72
New Noginsk Paper Reflects 'Democratic' Views *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Tyumen Oblast Soviet Proceedings *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Deputies Urge Rejecting Yamalo-Nenetsk Okrug *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 73
Dispute Over Stavropol Newspaper Registration *[IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]* 73
Novaya Zemlya Island Soviet To Be Restored *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Business Publication Founded in Nakhodka *[TASS]* 74
Report on Volgograd Cable Television System *[Moscow TV]* 74
Cable TV Network Established in Bryansk *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 74
Zaslavskiy Soviet Chairmanship Criticized *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 9 Dec]* 74
Omsk Paper 'Flirting With Extremists' *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 77

Prime Minister Silayev Arrives in Stuttgart

On Official Visit

LD1112134190 Moscow TASS in English 1312 GMT 11 Dec 90

[Text] Stuttgart December 11 TASS—Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev arrived today in Stuttgart on an official visit at the invitation of Lothar Spaeth, minister-president of the Baden-Wuerttemberg land.

Spaeth, Vladislav Terekhov, Soviet ambassador to Germany, and other officials met Silayev at the airport.

Silayev and members of a Russian governmental delegation will discuss the development of economic cooperation between Russia and Baden-Wuerttemberg.

The delegation will visit industrial, agricultural and scientific centres of the land, and meet German businessmen, scientists and public figures.

Silayev, Baden's Spaeth Comment

LD1112204490 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 11 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Stuttgart December 11 TASS—Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev arrived here today on an official visit at the invitation of Baden-Wuerttemberg Prime Minister Lothar Spaeth.

Silayev is accompanied by Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, Russian Foreign Economic Relations Minister Viktor Yaroshenko, Russian Justice Minister Nikolai Fedorov and other officials.

Silayev and Spaeth had a one-to-one meeting in the historical Neues Schloss Palace, the former royal residence. Then, the talks were continued with the participation of members of the Baden-Wuerttemberg cabinet and of the Russian Federation's delegation.

During the talks, the sides focused on the development of bilateral comprehensive cooperation, above all in the economy.

Speaking at a news conference held after the talks, Silayev thanked residents of this German state for the hospitable reception and their disinterested aid to soviet people.

"our visit is taking place at an important time for our countries," he said. "Germany's unification has been achieved. Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and German Chancellor Helmut Kohl made an impressive contribution to this unification.

"We hope that relations between the Soviet Union and the Federal Republic will assume a new nature and will reach a higher level. Russia and your state are making a contribution to this development."

During his Moscow visit last June, Spaeth signed a joint statement on expanding cooperation and developing friendly relations between the Russian Federation and Baden-Wuerttemberg.

"Today's exchange of opinions on the entire range of relations enables us to say that the understandings reached are turning into reality. However, we have untapped reserves.

"Changes in our countries give good impetus to the development of comprehensive relations between Russian organisations and their partners in Baden-Wuerttemberg."

In turn, Spaeth said that during the talks, the sides discussed specific areas of mutual cooperation. Much attention was given to agricultural production, storage and processing of agricultural produce.

"We know about difficulties with food supplies in the USSR and are seeking to help. However, no food supplies from abroad can tackle this problem. Only the sweeping reorganisation of agriculture can pull the country out of the present crisis.

"Taking into account the land reform in the Russian Federation, our government invited 200 Russian farmers to study local experience in 1991-1992."

The establishment of special economic offices in Stuttgart and Moscow will help strengthen cooperation in machine-building. These offices will familiarise partners with the latest technological development studies, Spaeth noted.

Agriculture Discussed

LD1212171590 Moscow TASS in English 1634 GMT 12 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Stuttgart December 12 TASS—Russian Premier Ivan Silayev is continuing his official visit to Baden-Wuerttemberg, one of the most economically advanced German lands. Its economy has developed in recent years at double the rate for the rest of the country. Its potential can be judged by such world-renown concerns as Daimler-Benz, Robert Bosch, Audi, Porsche and other companies.

Baden-Wuerttemberg has long-standing relations with the Soviet Union. It accounts for 40 per cent of all the Soviet metal goods exported to Germany. Soviet enterprises and associations have close contacts with more than 200 local firms.

Agriculture has now been added to the already traditional cooperation in mechanical engineering. Ways to further promote it were discussed on Tuesday at Stuttgart-Hohenheim University, famous for its oldest German agrarian faculty. Silayev told the hosts about the main directions of the land reform in the Russian

Federation, which is based on the equality of all forms of land ownership, including private property.

Deputy Premier Gerhard Waiser, who is responsible for agriculture and forestry, dwelt on the specific features of German agriculture. He said the state played an important role in its development by granting subsidies to small farmers. The development of this sector is accelerated by competition among private enterprises and cooperatives, whose shares are approximately equal in the business of storing and transporting farm products, their processing and marketing.

The Soviet guests were asked many questions, testifying to the hosts' keen interest in Soviet developments. It was noted that the success of reforms depended on initiative and spirit of enterprise, state and private investments in agriculture, and optimum size of land plots. The problem of making agricultural labour attractive for young people worried both sides.

The university directorate expressed readiness to provide advanced training to an additional number of Soviet farm specialists.

Silayev met Baden-Wuerttemberg businessmen on the same day at the land's economics study centre. Speaking on their behalf, Chairman of the Land Metal and Coal Industry Association Dieter Hundt said that West German businessmen's cautious approach to the Soviet market was explained by instability in the USSR, shortage of hard currency and disputes between the republics and the centre.

Silayev said that present difficulties in the USSR were temporary and that the establishment of market relations, primarily in the Russian Federation, would create favourable conditions for foreign investments. The Russian premier urged German businessmen to seek partners in the Russian Federation, who have now been granted full independence. He praised the work of the study centre, which provided advanced training to many Soviet economic managers.

Receives Truck Donation

LD1312120390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1706 GMT 12 Dec 90

[Excerpts] Stuttgart, 12 Dec (TASS)—[passage omitted covered by referent item] "Another day in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] delegation's stay in Baden- Wuerttemberg was marked by a solemn event: A ceremony at the Daimler-Benz motor works, at which 12 large container trucks were handed over to the "Care Deutschland" charity. They are intended for the transportation of food and medicines from the FRG to the USSR." [passage omitted]

"I.S. Silayev thanked the management of the firm, its workers, the charitable organizations, and all citizens of the FRG for their readiness to extend the hand of assistance to the Soviet Union in this difficult period of transition. Soviet people give due appreciation to the support that is being extended: It will encourage the strengthening of friendship between the peoples of the two countries." [passage omitted]

An agreement on the joint production of motor buses in the town of Golitsino, Moscow oblast, was signed in November of this year. The implementation of this project, I.S. Silayev noted in conversation with a TASS correspndent, will not, however, meet the Soviet Union's requirement for motor buses. A difficult situation is arising in the USSR because of difficulties with supplies of Hungarian "Ikarus" vehicles. Every year between 30-40,000 new motor buses of different types are needed, in addition to those being produced at the present time. In this matter we are placing great hopes upon Daimler-Benz, a business with a high reputation worldwide, and with which contacts have been maintained for a long period. We have given the firm's management our own concept of the organization of the joint production of motor buses. We are planning a wide-scale involvement of defense industry enterprises, primarily engineering works. This will simultaneously permit the solution of complex social problems wich are coming to a head in this industry. It will be possible to jointly launch the production of motor buses not just for the USSR, but for export to third countries in order to cover the project's foreign currency expenditure. We hope our proposals will receive a positive response in Germany in the very near future, Silayev said.

I.S. Silayev and [Baden-Wuerttenberg Minister-President] L. Spaeth signed a memorandum today on deepening cooperation between the RSFSR and Baden-Wuerttemberg in the spheres of the economy, transport, science, research, agriculture, education, culture, and others. In particular the document provides for the setting up of a joint commission to coordinate the whole range of questions of bilateral cooperation. It will report back regularly on its work to the heads of government. It is intended to open bureaus dealing with links in both Stuttgart and Moscow in order to improve cooperation and widen contacts between firms and enterprises.

The heads of the two governments signed an agreement for 100 RSFSR farmers to have periods of work experience on farms and in organizations in Baden-Wuerttemberg, and a document on training and raising the qualifications of leading cadres in the RSFSR economy.

The document-signing ended the official visit to Baden-Wuerttemberg by I.S. Silayev. The RSFSR delegation he heads will begin a tour of North Rhine-Westphalia on Thursday at the invitation of Johannes Rau, the head of government of that land.

Meets Chancellor Kohl

LD1312151990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1325 GMT 13 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondents Nikolay Kalintsev and Mikhail Stepovik]

[Text] Bonn, 13 Dec (TASS)—FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl received Ivan Silayev, chairman of the

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, here today.

A friendly and frank conversation took place with the main attention focussed on aspects of economic policy.

I.S. Silayev informed the chancellor of progress in implementing the program of the transition to a market economy and described the opportunities which are opening up for the German economy in this connection. Both sides stated their willingness to work in every way toward broadening and deepening mutually advantageous deals between enterprises, firms, and organizations of the German lands and the Russian Federation. H. Kohl and I.S. Silayev had a detailed discussion of the problems which still need to be solved so that economic and scientific-technical contacts may be more vigorously developed.

The question of cooperation in the training and requalification of cadres and in actively drawing the German side toward housing construction on the territory of the Russian Federation was examined both specifically and in connection with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Germany.

The general conclusion drawn by the two sides was that the new phase in relations between the German people and the peoples of the USSR is opening up broad opportunities for partnership between the FRG lands and the republics of the Soviet Union.

Questions of strengthening bilateral relations were also at the center of a conversation between I.S. Silayev and Hans-Dietrich Genscher, deputy federal chancellor and FRG minister of foreign affairs.

At the same time, it was pointed out that radical advancements in the international situation are creating favorable preconditions for stable long-term interaction between the FRG and the USSR, and between the German lands, and the Russian Federation in various fields. In this context the extremely great significance of the treaty on good-neighborliness, cooperation, and partnership between the USSR and the FRG and also the agreement on wide-scale economic cooperation for the development of diverse contacts at the lands and republican level which were signed recently in Bonn, was emphasized. Reference was made to the centuries of mutually fruitful ties between the peoples, economies, and cultures of the two countries, and that hostility and alienation are a thing of the past.

I.S. Silayev and the RSFSR delegation which he is heading are in North Rhine-Westphalia at the invitation of Johannes Rau, head of the land government.

Later in the day, talks were held in Duesseldorf between I.S. Silayev and Johannes Rau. At a meeting with journalists, the head of the state government stressed the traditional and fruitful nature of relations between Nordrhein-Westfalen and the Russian Federation, which have a firm treaty basis. There was no need for us to get acquainted with each other, Rau said. I.S. Silayev and I have been partners for a long time, although this is the first time he has been here in his new capacity. Unlike the RSFSR delegation's visit to Baden-Wuerttemberg, which was an official one, the visit to our state is more a working one. During an intensive exchange of views, we discussed a wide range of specific problems, above all the progress being made in implementing accords which have already been reached. We came to the conclusion that there is no reason for us to be alarmed. Work on joint projects is proceeding normally. This also applies fully to the large-scale participation of firms from Nordrhein-Westfalen in the program to protect the USSR environment. The implementation of this project, which is estimated to cost almost DM1.5 billion, is in full swing, although we will not be able to assess the final results for several years. Agriculture is becoming another area of cooperation. Agreement was reached for 100 Russian farmers to undergo training in our state. Specialists from Nordrhein-Westfalen will also give practical assistance in reorganizing agricultural production in the RSFSR, J. Rau concluded.

After giving high praise to the existing level of bilateral relations, I.S. Silayev noted that the profound changes taking place in the USSR and the RSFSR present the German laender with favorable new conditions for cooperation. This means that Russian enterprises will be able to establish direct links with firms in the FRG. Small and medium-sized enterprises, including private ones, are going to play an increasingly active role in Russia. This does not reduce the importance of major joint projects in such areas as the processing of agricultural produce, ecology, and extraction and more rational use of mineral resources, however. We are profoundly satisfied with the support given to the reforms taking place in the USSR, not only by officials but also by ordinary citizens. The large-scale campaign of assistance which is under way in the FRG shows that the Germans are a friendly people who are striving to assist us so that we can overcome our temporary difficulties as quickly as possible.

Kohl on Role of Ethnic Germans

LD1312151390 Hamburg DPA in German 1403 GMT 13 Dec 90

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—On his next trip to the Soviet Union, Chancellor Helmut Kohl wants to visit the ethnic Germans. Kohl expressed this wish in talks with Ivan Silayev, premier of the Russian Soviet Republic, in Bonn today.

According to Government Spokesman Hans Klein, there was agreement that Soviet ethnic Germans could play an important role in the development of economic cooperation between the two countries. Around 1 million ethnic Germans live in the largest Soviet republic. Their opportunities must be improved so that they do not leave their homes, the two heads of government agreed.

Kohl also called for the old and new laender to be involved in economic cooperation with the USSR. The education and training of agricultural experts and managers of the economy in particular should be part of this, Kohl and Silayev said. The home construction program agreed upon between the Federal Republic and the USSR must be centrally coordinated. Concerns from the laender and the republics should be incorporated in its implementation.

Silayev, who earlier visited Baden-Wuerttemberg, also had talks in Bonn with Federal Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. Genscher expressed the German interest in the stability and integrity of the Russian Republic. According to the Foreign Ministry, the two partners in these talks conducted an exchange of views on the significance of federalism, which would play an important role in the Europe of the future.

Chamber Chairmen on Supreme Soviet's Work

91UN0456A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report under the rubric "From the Stenographic Record of the Congress:" "A Heavy Obligation—Check Every Step With the Law; Chairmen of the Chambers on the Style of Work in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] *Statement by V.B. Isakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, at the evening session of the Congress on 6 December.*

Chairman: The first microphone, please.

Isakov, V.B., Kirov Territorial Electoral District, Sverdlovsk Oblast:

Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, as chairman of the Soviet of the Republic of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet I wanted to speak on the foregoing question and I made a request earlier to do so, but unfortunately did not have the chance. I would nevertheless like to spend a few minutes talking about "other business."

From the hall: Do so!

Isakov, V.B.: Esteemed deputies, I beg your pardon for my insistence in pushing so impertinently to the dais. I am aware that you are tired by the end of the day but I do have an opinion on the work of the Supreme Soviet and I would like to talk about it.

Like you, I understand that establishing the new organ of power is not simple. The Supreme Soviet of Russia is a new organ of power, both in terms of its form of work—it is an organ of power in permanent session—and in terms of its composition—the people are new. And in establishing it there are also gains and losses. What would I call the gains? First, that in the work of the Supreme Soviet, particularly in the work of the Soviet of the Republic, which I have been assigned to lead, a start has been made on reviewing the truly important problems pertaining to state development. A certain style of work is beginning to take shape. Scholars have appeared in the Supreme Soviet who are participating in a review of many of our matters. The body of chairmen of the commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet, which contains skilled and competent people able to cope with the complex tasks facing the Supreme Soviet, is also an undoubted gain.

Now, if you will forgive me, the losses, which have caused disillusionment and dissatisfaction. It must be recognized that in both the structure of the Supreme Soviet and in the organization of its work, the chambers have, unfortunately, not yet taken their proper place. Many important issues, such as, for example, the law on local soviets, the formation of budgets for local soviets, pensions, and enterprises and entrepreneurial activity, have been passed on to the joint session without debate in the chambers. As a result, the law on local soviets has not even had a first reading. The same is true of the law on budget formation. The law on pensions has been passed but fierce polemic is raging about it. The chairman of a chamber that is dealing with socioeconomic matters, myself included, must be asked to account for this failure. But how can that chamber chairman respond when even I do not know which matter will be passed on for the joint session and put on the agenda? My opinion as an expert on this draft legislation is of interest to no one. And just like at the congress, it is a fight just to get to the dais. The deputies are rightly remarking on the low level of organization at the session. It shames me to say it, but the session is already drawing to a close but we still do not even have a firm agenda. It was adopted on the first day as a basis, and about 60 proposals were submitted. And this is how the matter still stands today.

Unfortunately, not everyone in the Supreme Soviet understands that lawmaking is also drudgery, also a kind of production with its own technology that must be strictly observed. We have cast aside this drudgery at some stage and straightened out the road, and as a result we have obtained laws that either do not work or work badly.

Esteemed comrades, we have recently turned often to the history of our motherland, pondering the causes that led us into crisis. And always among those causes we find a retreat from the principles of legality. This is why as a lawyer I perceive with pain and disillusionment the retreat from legality in the activity of our parliament. Unfortunately, it has become a quite widespread practice. A draft may be signed in the absence of a quorum, in violation of established procedure, or a draft on which no vote has been taken at all may be included in the minutes of a Presidium meeting. Unfortunately, Deputy Sayenko is right here. They include resolutions such as "On the RSFSR Foreign Trade Bank," "On the RSFSR Gosbank Chairman" (that is, a personnel matter), "On the Creation of the Industrial-Commercial 'Russkiy Dom' Joint-Stock Company," "On the Russian Association for Economic and Scientific and technical Cooperation with Japan," "On the Social Development and Restoration Fund," and others. Some of them make provisions for major tax concessions and for very serious economic responsibility. And violation of procedure in adopting these resolutions is something I consider intolerable.

I understand that someone may now take up these facts and start to say: Here we have abuse of power and the exceeding of power and so forth. But I think that here the reason is more transparent. It is a basic reluctance to deal with members of the Presidium and defend one's viewpoint to them, and to make things simpler: take the established procedure and then bypass it. Unfortunately, there are instances of this now, at the congress. And here I must disagree with Boris Nikolayevich and his desire to put down some decisions. On the other hand, I would say that our parliament and its Presidium have not yet cut their teeth and we do not see any appetite or desire on the part of deputies to defend their rights.

The first steps taken by our Russian press are also a cause for concern. I have had to raise this issue three times in the Presidium, but have still failed to convince my colleagues that if the founder of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA—the Supreme Soviet—is mentioned in the title then the charter of that newspaper should be approved by the Presidium.

The situation with the newspaper ROSSIYA is even more complicated. Its title signifies that it is the newspaper of the Supreme Soviet Presidium. But there are two other founders that few people know about. These are the Serpukhov Paper Factory and the abovementioned "Rossiyskiy Dom" [as published] industrial and commercial company, which registered issue 261 of the newspaper on 24 October. I welcome the first steps of our young Russian business, but merging with it will hardly bring glory to our legislaturet.

In the latest issue of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI I read the congratulations to Ruslan Imranovich on his assumption of the post of editor of the newspaper ROSSIYA. Let me add my congratulations to them. But I must say that in the Presidium we have still not considered this matter.

The fact that matters pertaining to the structure and staffing of the apparatus have been virtually removed from the control of the highest organ of power—the Supreme Soviet—is having an adverse effect on the work of the Supreme Soviet. Even though the regulations state that these matters should be resolved by the Supreme Soviet. But during all the time of its work these problems have never once been considered in the Supreme Soviet. At the same time, I have serious objections to some of the decisions. For example, just the latest two sets of instructions from the deputy chairman set up a working group for the Constitutional Oversight Committee made up of 91 persons, and 13 premises and 800,000 rubles [R] were allocated for equipment. The next resolution decided that there were to be 25 people in the apparatus of the Council for Foreign Relations. In sum, this is almost as many people as are working now in all the other commission and committees on a permanent basis. I am sure that if these resolutions had been submitted for its consideration the Supreme Soviet would have not adopted those decisions.

Esteemed comrades, it gives me no pleasure to report these facts to you.

It seems to me that if such things are widespread in our legislature (and unfortunately this is so) then it is necessary to eliminate this phenomenon before its sets down deep roots. The disease has been noted, it is there for all to see, and I would move here to take bitter but unavoidable steps. You have in your hands a draft resolution prepared by the "Rossiya" group and a draft resolution from the "Smena" group. In my opinion it is quite possible to produce a single acceptable resolution from these two drafts. Take the main part of the "Smena" group resolution and the resolution part—the three clauses suggested by the "Rossiya" group.

Finally, in the declaration on state sovereignty we have proclaimed that the Russian Federation is a rule-of-law state. Some people will probably think that these words are some kind of honorary title. I assure you that it is quite the opposite. It is a heavy obligation—check your every step, your every action, with the law. It would be a pity if the words "rule-of-law state" turned out to be for the Russian people just another empty sound. Thank you (applause).

Statement by R.G. Abdulatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, at the morning session of the congress on 7 December.

Esteemed Chairman, esteemed people's deputies, it seems to me that in all things, the largest and the smallest, for some reason we look for reasons to deepen the contradiction that we have been more or less overcoming in the work of the Supreme Soviet since the First Congress of People's Deputies. I think that if we go along that road and necessarily analyze every statement, and even more if behind every statement there is an absolute accusation of falsehood and so forth, then soon no one will be speaking sincerely from this dais (applause).

The main directions in the activity of the Soviet of Nationalities. First, we consider our chief need to be dealing with the injustice that has been permitted with respect to repressed and deported peoples.

The second problem is the numerically small peoples.

The next problem is the problem of our republics—the Russian Federation and the autonomous formations. It seems to me that the congress (and we make the preparations for that on instructions from the Council of the Federation) should express itself on matters pertaining to the federal arrangement of the Russian Federation. I would even suggest that this question be debated here, at the congress, along with the question of the Union treaty, and that a special resolution be adopted on the fundamental foundations of the federal arrangement for the Russian Federation with respect to the Union treaty.

One of the main questions with which the Soviet of Nationalities is engaged, and should be, is the question of the Russian nation. I totally disagree with those who call the Soviet Union an empire, and here what I have in mind is that within that alleged empire an imperial nation would supposedly be living, a nation that lives better than others and is developing better than others. I think that the problem of the national rebirth of the Russian nation is a fundamental issue, and I am convinced that while the Russian people feel unhappy in Russia, no other nation will be happy in Russia! (applause)

But I would like to make a small comment with respect to our friends and neighbors—the Soviet of the Republic—who for some reason have insisted on the creation of a commission on culture even though these matters have been transferred constitutionally to the sphere of activity of the Soviet of Nationalities. The creation of two commissions has in fact created a precedent in the Supreme Soviet, as if the Soviet of the Republic were engaged in dealing with Russian affairs and the Soviet of Nationalities with non-Russian affairs. I object categorically to such approaches and I believe that the problem of the development and rebirth of the national culture of the peoples of Russia is inseparable from the rebirth of the national culture of the Russian people themselves.

Very briefly on the activity of the Supreme Soviet. I agree with the assessments that have been offered here, but it seems to me that in contrast to these stages of development, confrontational statements by deputies in the Supreme Soviet have not been greeted with applause. I consider that a positive factor that will provide us with an opportunity to work on further.

This is being helped (I must say) by the stances taken by Boris Nikolayevich and Ruslan Imranovich, who, also during the joint work, have come closer to the center. This is a very important factor in the work of the Supreme Soviet. But we should not forget the role of the individual. I think that in a situation that has in fact not improved during the time of our work, and in fact has even deteriorated in terms of many parameters, they would perhaps have started to drive us out were it not for the political figure of Boris Nikolayevich. And in this sense, we should say it unambiguously and provide every possible support for the work of the Supreme Soviet chairman.

But along with Boris Nikolayevich people have come to the Supreme Soviet who have no experience of life, and who are often incompetent and still in a state of euphoria with respect to their access to power. I believe that such people think that they can grasp things beyond their reach (applause).

I think that Boris Nikolayevich can sort out these matters without my help, and I feel that the usefulness of the activity of those people (and they are just individual people, not large numbers) is for Boris Nikolayevich less than the hindrances they create.

Now, the subject of the newspapers of the Russian Federation.

I think that the enormous amount of work that has been done by Ruslan Imranovich has made it possible for us to have our own newspapers in short order. Now all that remains is to clarify the extent to which these newspapers are our own.

There is another issue. When we talk about newspapers and it is officially written down that it is an organ of the Supreme Soviet Presidium then it is essential that personal ambitions not be reflected in a newspaper, but that the overwhelming position of the Supreme Soviet be reflected.

If the first issue of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA says that even those appurtenances of state that today we have still not abolished constitutionally are being tipped out of the sack and onto the trash heap of history, then that newspaper cannot in fact promote harmony in either the Supreme Soviet or the Russian Federation (applause).

Esteemed comrades, the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet and the structures of the Supreme Soviet and the old Supreme Soviet were built on the work of a unicameral Supreme Soviet. Hence the total underestimation of the role of the chambers. They have become some kind of appendages. Even though Boris Nikolayevich is offering his direct support, it is a question not of support for the chambers but the policy of the Supreme Soviet and the levers and the chambers that should pursue this policy.

For a year the USSR Supreme Soviet has virtually been working through its committees and commissions. It is only after a year that they have recognized in the USSR Supreme Soviet the need to transfer the work through the chambers. All bicameral parliaments in the world operate through their chambers. But this work is still being inadequately introduced in the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

The committees have become a virtually monopoly. This has also been helped by the fact that the chairmen of the committees have not been confirmed and agreed on a parity basis in the two chambers. Today the chairmen of the committees often feel that they are monopoly formations. It is not a question of giving power to Isakov or Abdulatipov. It is a question of the ability of the Supreme Soviet to work, a question of the integrity of the activity of the Supreme Soviet itself, a question of coordinating that work. Otherwise this is what we have:

lack of any coordinating role in the apparatus leads to a situation in the Supreme Soviet in which some deputies are emerging who have in their pockets blank forms for any kind of resolution to cover any contingency in life. And this leads to randomness in our work.

The fact that within the Supreme Soviet the main work is nevertheless transferred from the chambers leads to a situation in which the deputy chairmen are involved in work within the Supreme Soviet. Hence I consider that one of the main shortcomings in the activity of the Supreme Soviet is the absence of any clear-cut link with the territories and republics.

Nikolay Ilich Travkin started to do something in this sense. But today he has returned to party activity. Today the Supreme Soviet does not have clear-cut links with the local soviets. But without these any activity by the Supreme Soviet will have no influence (applause).

Finally, the most painful issue of all—the issue of the quorum. This is mentioned most often when we are talking about the Soviet of Nationalities.

It seems to me that today the Soviet of Nationalities is doing very difficult and selfless work on many parameters. I believe that these are the reasons for this.

The first reason is that the commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities have no prestige. All the deputies who spoke here at the First Congress of People's Deputies said that we favor the revival of national cultures and the preservation of the cultural and historical heritage. But when we started registration for the commissions it turned out that nine signed up for the Culture and Protection of National Cultural and Historical Heritage Commission, while about 200 signed up for the International Affairs Committee.

Second, if one works in the commissions of the Soviet of Nationalities then one cannot be in charge of sectors. But many of the people working in the committees want to be in charge of sectors.

It would be a good thing if this congress were to decide whether or not all members of the Soviet of Nationalities were to work on a permanent basis or whether some other term should be employed—on the basis of permanent representation, that is, so that each territory would be represented by people in the Soviet of Nationalities. What we have today is that, according to my calculations, in the Russian Federation there are about 160 nations and nationalities while only 18 are represented in the Soviet of Nationalities. And if we opened up opportunities for the territories to have more nations represented in the Soviet of Nationalities, then the representatives of the nationalities could be recruited for work in the Supreme Soviet.

Finally, dear comrades, the work depends largely on the activity of the deputies themselves. If a person has moved to work on a permanent basis, if this is his place of work, then it is essential that he go to that work at least three or four times a week (commotion in the hall).

There is something else. If the work of the Supreme Soviet were organized better then it would be possible to insure that deputies turned up for the voting.

I believe that the people's deputies of the Russian Federation are friends and like-thinkers regardless of many other factors. And we must nevertheless strengthen this aspect of things. It is essential to switch to civilized relations. I would ask the people's deputies from the national state formations nevertheless to weigh things carefully when we talk about safeguarding national interests. Some "national heroes" are moving to complicate mutual relations between nations in various regions.

I thank the congress for the opportunity I have had to speak (prolonged applause).

Silayev on Reforms, Possible Conflicts

PM2111152290 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 45, 18-25 Nov 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev by Lyudmila Telen: "Russia Without the Union?"—date, place not given]

[Text] Russia's economic programme began its official countdown on November 1. The 500 days began running out, but not the credibility of the Russian authorities. Their public rating is still very high. Nevertheless there was no jubilation on the occasion of Russia's entering the "transition period". The first few days were darkened by another aggravation of tensions between Russia and the Centre, which brought about an undeclared war between parliaments and governments.

While denying the possibility of secession, Russia nevertheless adopted the law "On ensuring economic sovereignty" and began "dividing up property". The price reform "a la Ryzhkov" continued, with prices for brandy, champagne, instant coffee—and possibly other goods non-available in shops and therefore unnoticed—going up Mikhail Bocharov, an associate of Boris Yeltsin from the Inter- Regional Group, granted an interview to the Rabochaya Tribuna newspaper in which he criticized Russia's authorities and spilled the beans about their internal differences. Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, another Russian leader and the ideologist of the reform, publicly confirmed, at the very moment his programme was being launched, that it was not feasible under the changed conditions, and insisted on resigning from the Russian cabinet.

Rumours about film stars are proof of their popularity. Rumours about political "stars" are evidence of public confusion. In the last few days, rumours became especially rife—not only among the masses who demand Boris Yeltsin's public appearance to make sure he safe and sound. Rumours abound in the corridors of power, too. Ivan Silayev is said to have had words with the President. And the President is said to have offered Grigoriy Yavlinskiy the chairmanship of the Inter-Republic Economic Committee.

Anyway, political foecasts can no longer rely on logic, as the number of political riddles increases.

Will Russia be able to avoid confrontation with the Centre? Will it be able to protect its sovereign interests without infringing on the interests of neighbouring Republics? Can the principles of radical reform remain intact? These and other questions were put by Moscow News to Chairman Ivan Silayev of Russia's Council of Ministers on the second of the 500 days allotted for Russia's transition to a market economy. He said:

The Russian authorities have repeatedly stated that they stand for a single market, do not see Russia outside the Union, but desire a fundamental renovation of the Union. We adhere to this position, and therefore are doing everything possible to avoid Russia's economic isolation while it begins moving towards the market economy according to its own programme.

[Telen] What steps have you already taken to resolve the conflict between Russia and the Centre?

[Silayev] We believe in active, multilateral consultations on an equal footing. On November 2, an official invitation was issued to the USSR President to meet with the Presidiums of Russia's Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. We count on the presidents of chairmen of other Union Republics' Supreme Soviets taking part in the meeting. At the same time, consultations between the Union and Russian cabinets are being prepared. I don't think the central government will refuse to take part.

[Telen] What is the source of your optimism?

[Silayev] We go on trusting their goodwill, and are ready to show our own. No doubt, both sides are interested in mutual respect.

[Telen] This does not preclude Russia's government and Supreme Soviet from pursuing a firm policy of sovereignty, does it?

[Silayev] One does not contradict the other. We do not want to damage the union, but neither can we waive Russia's sovereign interests. Today, these are not economically assured. This is clear, in particular, from the 1991 budget and plan developed by the central government. 90 to 95 per cent of all resources produced in Russia are still expected to be centralized. How can one speak of our Republic passing over to a market economy on such terms? The Russian government, having chosen the market economy, ought to guarantee economic freedom not only to the Republic as a whole, but also to every industrial enterprise on its territory. Once we have taken up the responsibility, we must enjoy the rights. This is why we have been forced to adopt the law "On ensuring the Russian Federations economic sovereignty".

[Telen] Does it mean you have given up hope of the centre's active support for the reform?

[Silayev] Why? We still hope and continue to insist on setting up a coalition government capable of reconciling the widely varying interests of the Republics.

[Telen] Aren't you afraid that Russia's government, now the centre with respect to its own numerous autonomies, might suffer the sad lot of the all-Union cabinet?

[Silayev] Theoretically speaking, such a danger does exist. But I think we shall be able to avoid it. Russia is prepared to set up a coalition government within its own borders. Very soon, a federal (or federative) economic committee is expected to begin operating within the framework of Russia's government. It will represent the interests of all territories. Otherwise the differences which may arise between Russia's autonomies might complicate the reform. We cannot afford this.

[Telen] Speaking in Russia's parliament, you made it clear that economic stabilization "a la Yavlinskiy" was no longer possible. Is it really sensible to begin reform with the financial system hopelessly ill?

[Silayev] What other option have we got? However unfavourable the circumstances might be today, we cannot retreat any further. But we must certainly correct our policies accordingly.

[Telen] Is it an intention or a concrete plan of action?

[Silayev] If you recall world experience, we are not the first to have to reform under severe inflation. Spain, Turkey and Poland have done so before us, and we would do well to use the means they have tested. There is a package of economic methods which help ease the shock of inflation for ordinary people, especially the least socially protected groups. Of course, these methods can only be effective in combination with radical changes in the entire economic mechanism, such as privatization, demonopolization of economy, land reform, etc. In any case, experience has shown that the rates of inflation can be curbed, the situation gradually stabilized and eventually improved. This is, of course, a more torturous way than the one suggested by Shatalin's group, but we can't ignore reality.

[Telen] Who has taken the torch from Grigoriy Yavlinskiy now that he has resigned? Or will the anti-inflation programme be anonymous now?

[Silayev] It is not. It has been designed by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy and his group. In a couple of days I expect their updated proposals and we are going to discuss them in great detail with the government.

[Telen] It has been rumoured in the Russian parliament that Yavlinskiy has received a very flattering proposal from the President...

[Silayev] I know nothing about it. But I am very sorry Yavlinskiy has not given up his intention to resign from the government, rather than devoting himself fully to the new programme. His work in the government is vital. The success of the reform is to a great extent dependent on how competent the cabinet is.

RSFSR Resolution on State Management of Economy

PM2311224790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Resolution "On Measures To Ensure State Management of the RSFSR Economy During the Transition to the Market Economy" issued by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on 23 November in Moscow]

[Text] In order to make state management more effective during the transition to a market economy, the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. The RSFSR Council of Ministers chairman is to be granted the right in 1990-1991: a) as appropriations ratified by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet allow, to make the necessary changes to the list of republican ministries, RSFSR State Committees, and other organs under the RSFSR Council of Ministers with the right to relieve RSFSR government members of their posts (except for chairmen of Councils of Ministers of republics in the RSFSR who are ex officio members of the RSFSR Council of Ministers); b) to appoint new RSFSR Government members on agreement with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on the basis of the findings of the relevant standing commissions of chambers and committees of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

2. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to be granted the right in 1990-1991 to revoke decisions by executive and economic management organs and by officials performing their activities on the territory of the RSFSR that contradict RSFSR legislative acts and RSFSR government resolutions.

3. The RSFSR Council of Ministers is to be instructed to report to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet at least once a month on the state of affairs in the RSFSR national economy and on the application of this resolution.

4. This resolution comes into effect at the moment of its adoption.

R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets, 23 November 1990

Dissemination of Constitution Draft Scored

*91UN0362A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian
24 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1, 6*

[Article by N. Garifullina: "How We Went About Procuring the Draft"]

[Text] Before you, dear readers, are two drafts of the Constitution of our republic. The first—the official one—was written by a working group and a group of experts of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's Constitutional Commission created, as is known, by decree of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. The second—an alternative—draft was presented by the action committee of RSFSR people's deputies—members of the "Communists of Russia" deputies' caucus—with the participation of some scientists. At the Constitutional Commission's meeting many members proposed that several drafts be published; however, this proposal was rejected, and the official draft selected as the preferred one with the clear understanding that it should be published no later than 20 November—which was duly announced in the press.

However, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA did not receive the text of the draft by the specified date. Meanwhile the phones at the editorial offices were ringing off the hook. Our readers—at first concerned, and then angry—began to reproach us that we did not want to publish this important document, and by this action were depriving our subscribers of information of vital importance to the interests of each RSFSR citizen. Therefore we have decided to let our readers in on this story which could easily serve as the plot for a short suspense novel entitled "How We Went About Procuring the Draft."

On the morning of 19 November, after all deadlines had passed, we called the technical secretarial section of the Constitutional Commission (tel. 205-54-60) and inquired when the draft would be available for publication. We were told that everything was ready and the draft would be delivered at any moment by messenger to the editorial offices, including SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Several hours later secretarial section employee L.I. Semina assured us that the courier had gone to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, after which he would without delay arrive at SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. Toward the end of the working day this version was confirmed by the deputy chief of the secretarial section, D.A. Yuryev. Finally, at 2130, section chief A.A. Sobyanin gave up: Yes, one copy had in fact been delivered to ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, but for your copy we need a cover letter; there is nobody available to sign it since the Supreme Soviet chairman is out of town. Call us tomorrow, he advised.

Next day we were referred to the Constitutional Commission secretary, O.G. Rumyantsev. He said the draft had not yet been signed at all, but some, as he said, of "our friends" had already printed an "unfinished" version in a number of local newspapers, thereby misleading the people, and now the Supreme Soviet was receiving indignant cables. Therefore, he said, we, together with Boris Nikolayevich, would continue work on the draft and then decide where to publish it. Call us tomorrow, he recommended.

At this point one clarification is in order. What esteemed Oleg Germanovich qualified as an unnecessary and unauthorized action by some mythical "friends" was in reality strict compliance with instruction No. 290-I of 31 October 1990 signed by R.I. Hasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and deputy chairman of the Constitutional Commission, and sent to all cities and nooks and crannies in Russia. Paragraph 5 of this instruction read: "To discuss the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation, adopted by the Constitutional Commission as a basis, at sessions of republic, kray, and oblast soviets, and to provide proposals, comments, and additions to the draft to the Constitutional Commission no later than 1 December 1990." Paragraph 13 instructed "the Ministry of Publications and Mass Media to ensure the publication of the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation in republic and local newspapers, to designate a special rubric in the republic organs of mass communications (radio and television broadcasts) which would deal with the new Constitution, and to urge members of the RSFSR Constitutional Commission and experts and specialists in constitutional law and political science to regularly publish materials related to the new Constitution of the Russian Federation."

We beg our readers' forgiveness for such a long quotation, but truly we find it hard to believe that the Constitutional Commission secretary is unaware of the instructions sent out by its deputy chairman.

"What next?" some impatient readers will ask. The answer: We have never received that draft from the Constitutional Commission. We finally managed to reach Oleg Germanovich by the evening of 22 November after our readers had already had a chance to read the draft earlier that day in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, and when the ARGUMENTY I FAKTY issue with the draft was ready to go to print. Oleg Germanovich confirmed that it was that newspaper that had been chosen to receive the draft, and that is precisely what had been done. It had also been decided not to give the draft to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, "but it was an unofficial decision, so I am telling you about it unofficially," Oleg Germanovich warned us, and kindly "permitted" us to reprint the draft from the Saturday (24 November) issue of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. We have followed this advice of the Constitutional Commission secretary, but we still cannot help but voice our opinion about this rather unsavory story.

Is it not puzzling that our esteemed Russian lawmakers, who declare in the very first article that "the Russian Federation is a sovereign, democratic, socially oriented, and rule-of-law state," themselves bluntly disregard the law. In this particular case, by refusing to give the draft Constitution to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for publication—and this draft, we repeat, affects the interests of millions of our subscribers, citizens of Russia—the leaders of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Constitutional Commission have violated Article 1 "Freedom of publication" and Article 24 "The right to receive information though mass media" of the USSR Law on Publications and Other Mass Media. The first article says that "freedom of speech and freedom to publish, which are guaranteed to the citizens by the USSR Constitution, mean the right...to choose, to receive, and to distribute information...." Article 24, in particular, reads: "State organs, public associations, and officials make the information they possess available to the mass media and provide the opportunity to peruse the documents.

"Refusal to furnish requested information may be appealed by a representative of the mass media organization, first to the higher level organization or official, and then to the court of law in accordance with procedures established by law for appeal of unlawful actions of state administrative organs and officials encroaching on citizens' rights."

So, we are thinking: What should we do? Perhaps, we should indeed appeal "unlawful actions" of our lawmakers who have violated the rights of both our readers and the newspaper?

And now we invite our readers' opinions on the drafts. Read them, study them, think about them. Our Fatherland's destiny is being determined today. It depends on your position, too. Send all your comments and proposals to our editors.

Ministry To Run Space Communications System

PM2611144390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Reply by Major Yeshchenko to reader's letter: "Launch Planned for 23 November"]

[Text] "It is common knowledge that in addition to national launches of space vehicles the United States also carries out commercial launches in the interests of individual states, countries, and industrial companies. And this venture is profitable, it is said. What about in our country? Is it planned to involve cosmonautics in commercial activity?

"Reserve Captain S. Tikhonov."

Major V. Yeshchenko, senior press officer to the USSR Defense Ministry's chief of space units, replies:

Of course this is a profitable venture. And, to be honest, it is a promising one. People living in the Russian Federation will be able to see that for themselves in the very near future when the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Communications, Information Technology, and Space becomes the country's first owner of its own satellite communications system. The commercial deal was completed in October and the final stage of preparation for launching the first of the three "Gorizont" communications satellites which have been ordered is being completed right now at the Baykonur space center. The launch is planned for 23

November. The second and third satellites will be put into orbit in 1991. The appearance of this commercial satellite means that channel two television will be available throughout RSFSR territory. You will agree that the venture is worth the effort if you bear in mind that hitherto almost 8 million people have been unable to receive channel two.

It will be no great secret if we say that we have received a number of proposals from other organizations, and there is still room in our portfolio to conclude a commercial deal with interested parties.

Telephone: Moscow 330-91-53.

RSFSR Deputy Ethics Commission Chief Named

LD0212111990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Dec 90

[Text] The Russian Supreme Soviet session began today by discussing candidates for the commission on deputy ethics. After a number of proposals and withdrawals, it was formed from 10 people. The commission was headed by Rostov Oblast deputy Sidorenko. The legislators then began to examine the question of confirming the powers of the Russian Federation procurator.

RSFSR Minister Views Media Plans

LD2011181190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 20 Nov 90

[Text] A news conference was held today by Poltoranin, Russian Federation minister of the press and mass media. He noted that at the present time, the struggle for the mass media has noticeably intensified, and under these circumstances, the defense of the rights of journalists is acquiring great importance. In particular, the minister pointed to the need to grant journalists the right to strike with the aim of defending their rights.

Speaking about the plans of the ministry, he announced the transfer to Russia of the Second All-Union TV channel, and the setting up of a Russian television and radio broadcasting company as well as a Russian news agency.

RSFSR Legislators Adopt State Pensions Law

LD2111105790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 20 Nov 90

[By TASS legislative correspondents Lev Aksenov, Yuriy Kozmin, and Pavel Ostrov]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Nov (TASS)—The law on state pensions in Russia, which affects the interests of many millions of the republic's citizens, was unanimously adopted by the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet today.

This large document, containing 134 articles and 51 pages of full text, envisages the rise in the minimum level of pensions in Russia compared to those in the USSR. Whereas the Union law establishes a minimum of 70 rubles a month, the new Russian law establishes the pension at the subsistence level. Its size will be established each year by the republican legislature. It has been fixed at 100 rubles for 1991.

Introduction of the social security contributions into the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic pension fund by all the working people brought a new aspect to the republican legislation. While citizens engaged in private enterprise will pay five percent of their income, the rest of the working people will pay one percent.

The law determines a number of privileges in establishing retirement pensions. If, on the whole, they can be paid to men upon reaching the age of 60 and women 55, for a number of categories this age has been lowered to 40-45 years.

During the aricle-by-article discussion, which continued during several sittings, many legislators noted that even the new pensions cannot fully provide an acceptable subsistence level for the pensioners. But, as the members of Supreme Soviet admitted, the general complicated financial and economic situation in Russia does not allow substantial increases in the minimum pensions.

Deputies Criticize Draft Constitution

91UN0410A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3

[Letter signed by RSFSR People's Deputies B.D. Babayev, A.S. Medvedev, V.I. Tikhonov, and V.N. Tikhomirov: "We Cannot Be Silent"]

[Text] We will note straight away that we will talk about the draft that was developed under the general direction of B. Yeltsin and that was published in the press for discussion. Not being lawyers, we will refrain from a special examination of the text, which for a normal constitution is too long, inasmuch as norms of the Basic Law are mixed up with norms of general juridical laws. We will concentrate our attention only on the political sphere of the constitutional draft.

We are immediately put on guard by the removal of the word "soviet" from the designation of our republic. The present situation gives one a lot to think about, although in the last version, instead of State Duma the "Supreme Soviet" concept is retained, and, in connection with local self-government, the thesis appeared (as a variant) about soviets, hurals [Mongolian local central councils], and the like. The statements of G. Popov, and not only his, that are directed against the soviets, reflect the attempts of certain circles to curtail elective positions and to expand appointments (but, you see, the representatives of "Democratic Russia" went into the elections under the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!"). Suddenly the "soviets" are not wanted, for they are hard to digest.

Let us go further. There where "soviet" is taken out of circulation, the word "socialist" automatically falls out of use. It turns out that the authors are thereby conducting a policy of "de-ideologization," as they put it. But is this so? It seems that here it is not a question of de-ideologization, but about the repudiation of a social and state structure that was achieved through much suffering. The ideas of socialism, great and noble, have long since become common to all mankind and are being widely implemented in the world. But when in OGONEK, O. Rumyantsev, secretary of the Constitutional Commission, "looks ahead," saying that "there will also be opponents who cling to the so-called socialist choice," then he (well, forgive us!) displays elementary ignorance.

The development of various forms of social property, state regulation of the national economy, the implementation of national and regional programs, the self-government of the people at various levels, social protection of the worker, and the like—these are all ideas of a socialist origin and character. We in no way question the fact that the economic status of the individual in our society must be raised, that his personal responsibility for his own well- being must be increased, and that the connection between his income and the results of his labor must be strengthened, and, nonetheless, under the conditions of our traditions and social psychology, it is necessary to guarantee the responsibility of society for each member and for the possibility of his all-round development as a worker and a personality. But this then has a direct relationship to the socialist choice. We must not mix distortions that arise among us with the ideas of socialism and on that basis reject socialism. Incidentally, A.D. Sakharov spoke about the fact that the capitalistic system adopted a multitude of socialist gains: participation of the workers in the distribution of profits, in the management of production, and others.

The press has already reported critical opinions that are directed at the draft of the Basic Law of the Russian Federation; for example, attention was directed to the fact that the elaborators "extracted" our Republic from the USSR and proposed to us "to live life as if anew." On 22 May, at the First RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies, B.N. Yeltsin, immediately after he developed the theme of the sovereignty of Russia, let drop the famous phrase: "But all of this does not mean that we are talking about some kind of confrontation with the center. The main direction is the same—strengthening the Union." In the well-known 500 days program, which was adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the strengthening of the Union SSR is seen as a fundamental premise of the stabilization of the economy and the transition to a market, which can be conceived effectively only as an all-Union market.

We are not inclined to idealize Union authorities, and we are not convinced supporters of the sovereignty of our Republic; however, for reasons of principle we cannot agree with the official draft of the Russian Federation Constitution, which in effect ignores the Soviet Union. Together with other already well-known methods, it is also pursuing a clearly designated aim—to rock the Union boat. However, in doing this, is it right to forget the fact, for example, that the basic part of the economic potential of Russia, which was historically formed as Union property, is actively oriented on all Union republics?

The draft of the Constitutional Commission fulfills the social order of those forces that, putting the winning of power in the forefront, are betting on a strong personality and preparing a "constitutional" transition to the regime of a strong personality. This fact is noted by many critics of this draft. Can it be that history has not taught us anything, and that we are again being purposely oriented on powerful personalities, cults and minicults?! It seems that our people have had enough grief, and that they have drawn the necessary lessons and do not want a repetition of the past, no matter what kind of popular personalities are being talked about. If in the future the question comes up about a president of the RSFSR, then he must be elected by the congress or by the Supreme Soviet and be fully responsible to the parliament. In this case, he will be under the control of democratically elected structures of a sovereign people, and not come forth as some kind of force that "counterbalances" the legislature.

One becomes especially apprehensive when the idea of a "strong president" is combined with ideas put forth by the elaborators of the draft in the section on a state of emergency. The appearance of such a section in the draft Constitution is quite symptomatic, and it corresponds fully to the political figure of a "strong personality."

We will also pay attention to the fact that the adoption of the draft really would mean the restructuring of all major elements of the state structures. Is any kind of a significant reorganization necessary at a time that is so crucial, complex, and disturbing? The answer can only be in the negative. Especially since it is proposed to make many changes according to the Western model, which is in direct variance with the obligation assumed by the elaborators "to honor the memory of our forebears."

And, finally, the adoption of the draft with regard to the election of the Republic's president means the dissolution of the soviets ahead of time, first of all the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and the resignation of all of the people's deputies. Naturally, the government will also have to resign. New elections. The replacement of the peoples deputies structure can be viewed only as a powerful factor of a destabilizing nature.

Although the draft under analysis has been published and an unprecedented campaign has been launched in its support, the matter has even come to such odious statements that allegedly this is the most democratic RSFSR Constitution of all the existing ones, the following, however, is indicative. There are 102 members in the Constitutional Commission. In the voting on 12 October, 46 votes were for the draft. This is not even half. Nonetheless, the draft was distributed to the people's deputies. In whose behalf? From the group of 46?

No, it was done in the name of the Constitutional Commission, but this is an elementary violation of democratic norms and procedures. A somewhat touched up draft ("cosmetic repair!") went through one more voting. There were 38 votes "for" and 32 votes "against," and again there was no necessary majority.

We will also point out that there was a violation of the will of the First Congress of People's Deputies that adopted this resolution on 22 June: "Instruct the Constitutional Commission to submit the main principles of the draft of the new constitution to a referendum and, with respect to the referendum, to prepare a draft RSFSR Constitution for consideration at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in January of 1991."

It is clear from conversations with a number of members of the Constitutional Commission that in fact the elaboration of the draft was usurped by a working group consisting of 14 persons, of which an absolute majority are persons in whom the First Congress of People's Deputies showed no confidence, having turned down their candidacies during elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Thus, the secretary of the Constitutional Commission himself was voted on four times, but each time he did not gather the necessary majority of votes. The draft reflects the position of one of the groups of "Democratic Russia." It represents an odd mixture of left radical ideas (the rights and freedoms of citizens, and others) with right radical views, about which we had a conversation.

The overall conclusion in the sense of a political assessment: The perpetration of a quiet constitutional coup in the Republic is being proposed. We cannot be silent in such a situation.

People's Deputies of the RSFSR: B.D. Babayev, A.S. Medvedev, V.I. Tikhonov, V. N. Tikhomirov

Khasbulatov Defends Russia's Defiant Stance

PM2811115190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

["Topical Interview" with Doctor of Economic Sciences R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by PRAVDA correspondent Ye. Sorokin: "Responsible for Russia"— date and place not given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The discussion of the question "The Situation in the Country," which came to an end in the Union legislature the other day prompted the leaders of the union republics to make a thorough analysis of the situation. How is it seen by the leaders of Russia on the threshold of the extraordinary RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies, which begins its work tomorrow? This was the subject of the PRAVDA correspondent's conversation with Doctor of Economic Sciences R. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

[Sorokin] Ruslan Imranovich, the situation in the country and in Russia has significantly deteriorated. During the debate in the Union legislature even the word "chaos" was very often heard. How would you assess the RSFSR's economic life?

[Khasbulatov] All the industrial regions in the country are on approximately the same level. I would call this a stage of primary industrial development. The beginning of a technological revolution, one might say. Only the distinction consists in the fact that a terrible disproportionality is to be observed, with oversaturation by the heavy sectors which bind together the whole structure of industry.

On the other hand the consumer sector is very underdeveloped. Industry is oriented toward all-union departments and has been virtually taken out of the Russian authorities' control; it is outside Russia's jurisdiction. The socioeconomic position of the population is obviously conditioned by this too. It is very oppressive.

Add to this attempts to reorganize the economic system itself on a flawed basis, in other words, simultaneously to apparently give rights to enterprises, but at the same time to leave in place the rigid structures of command, the traditional Gosplan [State Planning Committee], Ministry of Finance, and State Committee for Material and Technical Supply systems which led to the deterioration of management principles. In other words, the influence of the management system from above was counterproductive.

[Sorokin] Hence the attempts of the Russian Supreme Soviet to break away from the Center? Much has been said about this over two days in the Union parliament, and the leaders of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet have been criticized. But aren't you trying to create a smokescreen to hide your desire to set up a "society of prosperity in one separate republic"?

[Khasbulatov] No, not at all. After all, Russia is the backbone, the pivot of the entire Union. But our task is to avoid conceding the republic's interests. If we can achieve this, we will be able to give some kind of positive impetus to its development. I am not talking about the independent significance of the economic reform which we are proposing and on which we officially embarked 1 November. Even the steps that we are taking to transfer industry, agriculture, and the finance and other spheres increasingly to Russian jurisdiction and fend off the Center's unreasonable efforts to influence and prompt us—they too are for the good of Russia. And if they are for Russia's good, then they benefit other republics as well.

[Sorokin] But, after all, the actions of Tatarstan, the Yakut-Sakha SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and other republics which have declared their own sovereignty and have stated that they are entities of the whole Federation within the USSR, and not the RSFSR, can also be described as attempts to safeguard themselves against unreasonable influence, in this case from the Russian center? The same goes for the decision of one of the Moscow rayispolkoms [rayon soviet executive committees] on its sovereignty with regard to Moscow City Soviet. Next, some village or other will be declaring its own sovereignty...

[Khasbulatov] First, I have deep respect for the claims of the autonomous republics that talk about their sovereignty. There are no contradictions here, by the way. But what are we talking about in specific terms when we speak of the sovereignty of any former autonomous republic? About limits on the plenary powers, legislatively secured by the Russian parliament and by the new Federation Treaty which we have already drawn up together with all the entities of the federation. In other words, about specific plenary powers which should indeed be fully transferred to the control of the local authorities. And not just in the republics alone, but in oblasts, krays, and rayons too. But in the spheres of the powers which they transfer to the Russian Federation there is, and must be, supremacy for the laws of all Russia.

The issue of the clear definition of functions and authority of all the structures of power are very important for the RSFSR. At the present time we have just started to tackle it in real earnest. To consider what should happen at the rayon level, the city level, the oblast level, and so forth. By all means let a rayon be sovereign, if the word "sovereignty" pleases it. But within the limits of its legislatively enshrined plenary powers.

[Sorokin] But won't this lead to confrontation between the Russian center and the former autonomies?

[Khasbulatov] There is no confrontation between us. It is our opponents who would like to see that. And sometimes they even inflame these feelings. We negotiate on all questions.

[Sorokin] Russia intends to implement the "500 days" plan approved by its legislature, in spite of the fact that the Union Supreme Soviet has adopted a different program. But can the "500 days" plan be expected to succeed if even a group of U.S. specialists, after carrying out their own expert analysis, declared that the sole condition for its successful fulfillment is an all-Union market?

[Khasbulatov] Look, it was clear to me as an economist without any Americans that the most successful way of implementing this program is to synchronize processes, to control the reform process from a single center where the all the republics act unitedly, as they did when they participated in the elaboration of this program. And not just the Union, but the autonomous republics as well. That was such inspiring work! But the central government torpedoed the "500 days" plan, which did not meet its interests in terms of preserving power and outmoded structures. Especially the interests of the economic bureaucracy.

[Sorokin] After the Russian legislature adopted the "Law To Ensure the Economic Sovereignty of the RSFSR," people began to say that Russia had declared economic war on the Center. What is the situation in reality?

[Khasbulatov) There is not even a hint of anything of the kind. That really is a pretty primitive attitude. First, back at the first congress, in the Declaration of RSFSR Sovereignty, we defined the limits of our plenary powers perfectly clearly. We do not contest nuclear power, railroad transport, the defense sphere, and so forth.

[Sorokin] What about coal, oil, and gas?

[Khasbulatov] As for the strategic deposits, naturally they should not just be transferred to our ownership but should be placed under RSFSR jurisdiction. Look what is happening: There was an all-union ministry, and suddenly it has become a business concern. And a concern quickly declares that this is its property. And what is virtually a bureaucratic bourgeoisie is formed, which does not achieve efficiency, does not produce more goods for society, and does not raise people's living standards.

At the same time, yesterday's state functionaries become proprietors. This is a destructive, antidemocratic process. An essentially antisocialist process.

[Sorokin] But some republics have declared that they do not intend to sign the Union treaty.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, because they are being pressured! But they did participate in drafting the "500 days" plan, and they were prepared to enter an economic union. And once you have an economic union, it is not far to a political union. Look at the "Common Market," to which Mikhail Sergeyevich often refers. Why are they uniting there? Because they are free. That is the first reason. And second, they are voluntarily entering this union. Third, motives of economic survival force the lowering of customs and excise barriers, the establishment of a single currency, and so on and so forth.

[Sorokin] Has Russia's "500 days" plan, which you began to implement on 1 November, undergone any changes in view of the fact that it will be operating not in the conditions of an all-Union market but only of a Russian market?

[Khasbulatov] We are of course reviewing the "500 days" plan in view of the new circumstances. After all, in its primitive form it was based on the synchronization of reform processes on an all-Union scale. The Russian version has been drawn up on the basis of this program. And as for the legislative base, we are creating that too. We will underpin this program with a fundamental legislative base.

The Supreme Soviet has adopted a law on extending the economic activity of the soviets. It will give local soviets the opportunity for economic activity, partly via tax and other conditions. That is to say, we are really setting up a more or less classical system for the market sphere, so that the soviets can autonomously create enterprises and trade with other countries, oblasts, and regions. And a third feature: We are actively cooperating with the union republics, concluding direct agreements.

[Sorokin] The Supreme Soviet is still in its infancy, so to speak—it is only six months old. But it is "growing up" before our eyes. I think that you are threatened with the same disaster as the Union parliament. That is to say, that you adopt a law and it doesn't operate. Aren't you afraid that the parliament's work will prove fruitless?

[Khasbulatov] Your question is understandable. But I think that the truth lies on another plane. First, the reproach on account of the ineffectiveness of the laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet. This is partly due to the absence of a mechanism for introducing them.

But there is another factor as well—the Union republics have taken a clear course toward alienation from the Union and have declared themselves sovereign republics. They see in these laws no constructive force but attempts to leave everything in the old way. Of course, the president's 17 November speech turns on a "light at the end of the tunnel." But the danger remains that we will once again "mix" these radical measures too. There will then be only one solution: Each republic will have to save itself, protecting itself against the unreasonable actions of the Center.

This is really a very serious matter, and therefore our electors should know that, if there is indeed some definite opposition to the Center, it has nothing to do with our ambitions or attempts to replace Union structures with republic ones. It is nothing of the sort. It is a question of clearly expressed economic interests. The central bureaucracy is seeking to reserve control over Russia for itself. And the Russian parliament, naturally enough, seeks to realize self-government.

We are carrying into effect the decisions of the congress, and we will give the Declaration of State Sovereignty real substance. After all, at the end of the day we are talking about the fate of 150 million people. And not only them. If we really achieve our goals, if we give an impetus toward the dynamic economic development of Russia, our republic will become a kind of locomotive which will pull all the other republics along behind it.

I am confident that we can achieve very important success within the limits of these 500 days. This is why we try so vehemently sometimes to defend some things. This is why we are even going as far as a certain opposition. We should not retreat. At the present time we are setting up a joint commission of the two governments, of Russia and the Union. They must sit down at the negotiating table and determine the enterprises to be transferred to RSFSR jurisdiction. Moreover, we have created a tax system in which a significant proportion of tax deductions go into the local budget. And the people support us in this.

People are saying more and more: We want to work according to Russia's laws. Because they see that a significant portion of profits will go into the common coffers, the collective, for social development. This is what we mean when we talk about RSFSR ownership. That is to say that we want this ownership to benefit people. We have had enough of pouring capital and our people's efforts into a bottomless pit. After all, they are also not unlimited. People only have one life.

[Sorokin] A question arises in this connection: The "500 days" plan is very radical. But if you look at Russia, at this huge continent from Magadan to Leningrad, then sometimes you become somewhat fearful for the program's fate. How do you explain to a tractor driver from the countryside what the market is, how it should work in the new conditions? After all, the commercial vein, the desire to make a profit and to work productively, has been drummed out of the people for so many decades.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, you have asked perhaps the most difficult question of all. I believe that the Center and the president will take a sensible approach, that we shall find a common approach. But this is precisely the most difficult thing of all—to involve our workers, the working people, in this great reforming activity. The people who create plans by their own labor. In this, let it be said directly, an exceptionally important role must be allotted to you journalists.

At the Supreme Soviet, you will recall, people said: We are ready to hand over the land, but no one will take it. This kind of talk slanders our people, Russia's peasants and workers. The trouble is that our people have ceased to believe in the law, in its stability. The Russian state can and must employ its entire arsenal of command functions in order to humble the all-powerful functionaries. The most frightening force is the omnipotence of middle-ranking and minor functionaries in the localities. This is what we should fight. And here too, we cannot get by without the press.

We have on the whole equipped the government with the minimum amount of juridical laws and norms so as to create a basis for it to work seriously. But, both in meetings with the president and at the presidential councils, I keep trying to float the idea that all the processes which are happening in the republics and in Russia must be reckoned with. There is a desire for autonomy. Nothing will change just because some people try to check these processes. In the final analysis, both Yeltsin and Khasbulatov can probably be removed, but historical trends, once they have developed on the strength of certain circumstances, cannot be halted.

[Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its 26 November First Edition carries the following additional paragraph at this point:

[The Union government has no policy, no serious program. It stumbles about, dependent on circumstances. This is where the problem lies. A law to combat speculation is adopted, but it is illegal because this is the

Union republics' sphere. Next there is a decision to increase prices on so-called luxury items. In other words, what should be begun at the end of the reform is brought in at the beginning, in the absence of privatization and of antimonopoly legislation. Surely all this cannot be called a serious approach?]

I will tell you frankly that for me the impression emerges that the functionary class subordinate to the central government has elected for a strategic course to bring about a deterioration of the situation for people in Russia. In the most tense centers at that. These are Sverdlovsk, Tyumen, Bashkiria, Moscow, Leningrad, and other industrial centers, Udmurtia, the major industrial cities of Siberia, and the Far East. Look, they say, your idol has come to power, the democrats—look what they have done.

[The following paragraph is published only in the Second Edition]

Naturally, I do not take away responsibility from Russia's new state and executive structures. It would be naive to lay all the blame at the door of others for the prevailing situation. Our growing difficulties and indecisiveness also played a part. It is not simple, believe you me, to govern such a huge republic.

Of course, we will in all events try to ensure a living wage, or in any case not to worsen the very bad situation that exists today. This is why, of course, we have firmly opposed and are opposing price rises for ood products. Although these, we know, are being foisted on us by the central government. It has increased prices for corn and feed and thereby compelled our Russian government also to raise purchase prices for meat. But we will oppose this to the best of our abilities and, until the market is introduced, we will try not to allow price rises.

Second, we will endeavor to get inflationary processes under control. A Law on Pensions has now been adopted in order to provide our elderly citizens with higher pensions than envisaged by the Union law.

Although many experts from other countries oppose indexation, I think it is necessary in our beggarly conditions. I am personally against a rationing system.

We have sensible deputies, and they know that the most important thing is profound reforms in agriculture. I assure you that, if the major reforms in agriculture go as we have planned, we will achieve success before the end of 500 days. We must ensure the ability of peasant farms to develop in earnest. And then they will yield such an increase in the production of agricultural output that we will finally see the long-awaited saturation of the food market.

We have no other powers than the support of the people. And I believe that in the next two to three years we will achieve very significant success.

RSFSR Draft Constitutions Compared

91UN0457B Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 9 Dec 90 Second Edition pp 2, 3

[Comparison by I. Bratishchev, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy, doctor of economic sciences, professor, and B. Kurashvili, doctor of legal sciences and leading researcher of the Institute for Government and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, under the rubric "Discussion Podium": "Will Russia Be Socialist? Two Draft Constitutions—Two Political Courses"]

[Text] **On 24 November the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA published two draft RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] constitutions: the official one and the alternative one. The official one was developed by the Constitutional Committee of the republic Supreme Soviet. The alternative was the initiative of a group of RSFSR people's deputies with the participation of a number of scholars. Both drafts envision democratic organization of social and state life, and this makes them similar. At the same time it is becoming clear that in the description of the foundations of the sociopolitical structure the drafts are based on different premises.**

In the comparison of the drafts one can see the opposition of two general courses in political restructuring. The course toward extensive privatization and expropriation of public property, and actually the elimination of socialism and the restoration of capitalism—on the one hand. And on the other—a course toward socialism, but let us emphasize that this is not in the previous authoritarian-bureaucratic form but in a qualitatively new, modernized form—democratic socialism. To be sure, the term "democratic socialism" is now being used by certain proponents of eliminating socialism in order to mask the capitalistic essence of the course they have taken. We must give the authors of the draft their due: They do not resort to camouflage; they have a different device—to present capitalism as a "free society."

The alternative draft of the constitution stands in contrast not only to the official one but also, largely, to the "Basic Directions for the Stabilization of the National Economy and the Transition to the Market Economy," which were approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 19 October 1990 after what we see as an extremely hasty and superficial discussion.

We have before us the first case in the history of perestroyka when the opposition of two principally different concepts, two general courses in the perestroyka policy, have finally become clear and unequivocal. Thrown in the face of the leading capitalist- privatizers, Russian and Union, are the words: "Russia will be socialist!" Perhaps this will be the turning point in the prolonged process of perestroyka which, in our opinion, has so far been a mixture of good intentions, disorderly actions, a lack of form, a lack of character, and even political swindling (when the goals are proclaimed to be socialist but in reality things are proceeding toward the dominance of capitalism in the economy and the society).

We shall discuss the peculiarities of both documents in greater detail.

The Search for "Moral" Capitalism—Illusion or Artificial Fog

In the dense ideological fog generated by the disorderly, "model- less" way in which perestroyka (which, of course, has long been crucial and needed) is being conducted, various unscrupulous manipulations of the concepts "capitalism" and "socialism" have become possible. They say the difference between them is insignificant and nobody knows what socialism is and what modern capitalism is—and there is real socialism, and so forth. And all kinds of signs of one system or the other are going around. For capitalism, both classical and modern, this is private (not "labor private" but private capitalist) property, which is the main source of social inequality. For socialism it is public property, on which the social equality of people is based (while retaining that inequality which follows from distribution according to labor). In the reality of our country, as we know, both of these signs of socialism are distorted. Thus we must realize them in actions and not take advantage of any convenient occasion to "conceal" socialism.

When publishing its draft the RSFSR Constitutional Commission warned readers that "all preceding publications and variants of the draft...were purely preliminary." We are keeping this in mind. But we will also take into account the fact that the overall direction of the changes that were made was marked by a desire to conceal certain blatantly antisocialist points and, while retaining their significance, to make them less obvious. We have before us an instance of the effect of the rule: For an historical and systematic interpretation of juridical texts and an understanding of their real meaning it is necessary to go to the preparatory variants.

The official draft suggests a new name: the Russian Federation. As we see, the words "soviet" and "socialist" have been removed. A great deal stands behind these words!

In the chapter on principles, along with the general democratic points, which can only be welcomed, there is also the principle of a "social market economy." This point would not encounter any objections because of its name if it had to do with a market that is socialist by virtue of the composition of its participants or if it was primarily a socialist market. But this was not the case here! It says in the draft that "economic life in the Russian Federation is based on equal rights of all of its diverse types and forms." The document leaves no doubts about this.

To be sure, the initial draft that was adopted and disseminated by the Constitutional Commission as a "working basis" was changed in one of its key points but, frankly, it was only in the spirit of concealment. Judge for yourselves. In the "working basis" it was: "The inalienable natural right to private property is a guarantee of the interests and freedoms of the individual..." Now it says: "The inalienable natural right to be a property owner is a guarantee of the rights and interests of the individual..." (Article 3.1.1). And the article after the next one: "Property may be privately owned by citizens and associations of them..."

Now they are saying that private must be understood as any nonstate property. Here they ignore the scholarly understanding of private property, according to which (unless one is speaking about the "labor" form of it) one attribute of it is the application of hired labor. But it is this kind of private property that is reinforced as the predominant one in the draft. Or, rather, it is not reinforced, but "by hook or by crook" is imposed on the society.

Affirming the unshakeable nature of private property, the authors of the draft write that it presupposes "its moral and rational use." This is not a legally significant restriction but merely a well- intended or hypocritical ideological declaration. The authors of the draft, incidentally, called for "de-ideologization" of the constitution, but their work is shot through with ideology, only it is not socialist but bourgeois.

The curious nature of the "moral" declaration quoted above is revealed by the fact that in our sad reality it is addressed to a new class that is being formed, to new "masters of life"—the Soviet bourgeoisie, which consists almost entirely of criminal "shadow economy businessmen" or corrupt bureaucrats. This thieving mafia has very little to do with high morality. This is the way it is historically predetermined for the period of initial accumulation of capital. The process of the establishment of these property owners was taking place intensively in our country during the years of stagnation and it increased sharply during the years of "revolutionary" perestroyka. Whether we like it or not, so far this is the only large achievement of perestroyka in economic life. Guaranteeing private property owners the "interests and freedom of the individual," the draft at the same time encroaches on the interests and freedoms of people who are not property owners, that is, 90-96 percent of the society. Such is the morality of the draft.

Who Needed an All-Out Attack on Socialism?

In general the draft was taken from European bourgeois-democratic constitutions. But it would be an illusion to think that the "Swedish model" would appear on the basis of this draft. The modern and largely (although certainly not entirely) attractive socialized and humanized capitalism was a product of lengthy development, the workers' struggle for their rights, the influence of the countries of socialism, and the borrowing of its elements, and as a result—the appearance of civilized capitalism which rationally moderates its natural predatory inclinations. If in spite of reason we sell our socialist law of primogeniture for a song and enter on the path of eliminating the existing social system, neocapitalism will appear in our country after a generation. And that would be at best. In the mean time we will be covered with the sweat, blood, and dirt of classical capitalism. At best of the Latin American type.

Yet there are much easier and quicker ways of achieving material well-being under the conditions of political democracy on the path of socialist development and the changeover from authoritarian- bureaucratic socialism (which is, of course, absolutely abnormal and intolerable) to democratic socialism. Herein lies the essence of a correctly understood perestroyka, regardless of how certain political figures have changed its goal. These are the interests of the majority of the society.

According to figures from a poll taken by the VTsIOM [All-Union Center for the Study of Public Opinion] quite recently, under conditions where some of the "democratic" press is waging an all-out attack, unleashing all of its mud-slinging fury on socialism, which is not really being protected by anyone—under these conditions which disorient people, 36 percent of the Russians living in the RSFSR (and they comprise more than 80 percent of the population in this republic) are in favor of democratic socialism, 30 percent—in favor of "Swedish socialism" (that is, obviously, socialist elements in the "Swedish model"), and only six percent are in favor of capitalism. The remaining 28 percent have not decided yet (MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, 14 October 1990). One must assume that the other nationalities (besides the Russians) included in the RSFSR think approximately the same. This RFR [Russian Federated Republic] Constitution drawn up by the Constitutional Commission corresponds to the interests of these six percent of the population and serves this part of the society. This is the constitution of six percent—or, at best, 10 percent, regardless of how many you add to them—who have been deceived.

We Must Figure Out: Which Is Left and Which Is Right

But what is being suggested by the authors of the alternative draft? A group of people's deputies and experts have decided to oppose the skillfully promoted "constitution of 10 percent" with their own draft—a draft of a constitution that reflects the basic material interests and moral-political aspirations of the immense majority of the society. It had another purpose as well: to protect this majority from social degradation and ideological devastation ("Come and rule us, capitalist Varangians, for we cannot rule ourselves"). The authors of this draft are unified in their common socialist orientation, although this group has not been unified in its concrete ideas about the optimal model of the new socialism. As in powers with a socialist orientation that actually exist in life, in the group they singled out or, rather, discovered three trends: left, left-center, and right-center. This is if one uses the words "left" and "right" in the sense generally accepted in the world and not as they have been used in our country in recent years, where the capitalist promoters call themselves "left" and the proponents of socialism—"right" while unabashedly exploiting the prestige of the left in politics.

The left-wingers in the group thought that what is inherent in socialism and working to its advantage is the unconditional dominance of public property and the centralized management of it and they were barely able to agree to a diversity of forms of ownership and a market. The left-centrists insisted on this diversity and a full-scale competitive socialist market, relying on full market independence of people's (and not "state") enterprises and only unwillingly as an exception allowing private ownership and private capital entrepreneurship in strictly limited amounts. The right-center, while allowing extensive privatization is even—without thinking of the consequences—inclined to agree with the thesis of the equal rights of private property within the framework of the general predominance of public property. At the same time, true, the right-center was distinguished from the pseudo-left "radical democrats" who would impose on society unlimited privatization and full-scale capitalism in liberal clothing.

The alternative draft was the product of a compromise among these three trends. The authors of the present article were in favor of the left-centrist positions (it seems that these positions deserve public attention and, consequently, more complete and consistent presentation than what is given in the published alternative draft.)

The left-centrist modernizing line proceeds from the firm conviction that the already started and fully developed reactionary socialist revolt might be aborted if it is turned against antisocialist forces, including leading figures who have a strange understanding of their purpose and the constructive program which should be reflected in the constitution as well. One cannot say that all the developers of the alternative draft shared this conviction. With respect to certain points they felt unconfident and hastened to make concessions in places where a real alignment of forces would have made it possible to beat off the attacks of opponents. There was also a certain inclination to premature capitulation—the antisocialist hysteria is doing its work.

The most vexing thing was that in the alternative draft not all forms of ownership were adequately characterized, and for their names and definitions they used some classifications that were invented and used by the eliminators of socialism to conceal their intentions. But we should not hide and camouflage the social nature of each form, as has been done both in recent laws and in the "Shatalin program" and all those derived from it, but reveal their essence.

This "classification" is being imposed in all ways: 1) the property of citizens (in which the personal and individual-family are brazenly mixed up, which can also be called "labor private" and is actually private and private-capitalist forms of ownership); 2) collective property (in which they equally brazenly include private capitalist property in its joint-stock form); 3) state property (which strangely ceases to be the people's and in which they deliberately fail to single out various forms of its realization). All this is nothing other than a base for political swindling.

The October (1990) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee supposedly spoke out against extensive privatization, having written in its resolution that we should be oriented toward a prevalence of collective property. But if one includes here private capitalist joint-stock ownership, one comes up with political mystification: It is not a restriction of privatization but an encouragement of it.

The alternative draft is socialist on the whole, and for this it deserves support. But, while written mainly in the left-centrist spirit, in certain elements (private and joint-stock property) it shifts to the right when there is no special need for this. In this draft, not to mention the official one, private property is not placed in a separate article, and this erodes the distinction between the two different types of property—for consumption and for production. For the capitalist constitution this mixing is insignificant but for the socialist one it is in principle inadmissible. If private property assumes the nature of production property, it should be subjected to different legal conditions—the ones which rule out or restrict its use for man's exploitation by man and the alienation of the worker from the means of production. Such, incidentally, is the requirement of the internally contradictory Law on Property in the USSR, which was recently adopted but has already been "surmounted" in its socialist part and inflated in its nonsocialist part.

They Have the Right to Own Land...But Who Are They

Regulating—extremely liberally—private property, the constitution cannot bypass the question of the plot of land that is under construction with a residence or dacha right next to it. There is no need to introduce a law on private ownership of the land in order to grant the right to dispose of this plot upon the sale or bequest of the home (dacha). The right of inheritance is sufficient. Losing sight of this, using the usual interpretation of private property, many city dwellers are in favor of this according to polls regarding the possibility of legalizing private property. The do not think about the fact that, in the hands of zealous "radical democrats" and capitalist privatizers, this could become a "decisive" argument in favor of practically unlimited private ownership of the land. And yet realization of this intention could lead to the creation of landed estates on which the new farm-laborers would work. It is no accident that there are many fewer proponents of private ownership of the land among rural residents than among city dwellers: They have a better understanding of what is what.

The extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies which is now in session adopted a decree which lays the basis for privatization of the land. It establishes something in between private ownership of land for agricultural purposes (it is turned over to the farmer but can be sold through the soviet) and indefinite inherited ownership. This has been perceived as a legalization of private ownership of the land. This norm contradicts the RSFSR Constitution that is in effect. We shall see if the situation changes after the forthcoming changes are made in the constitution. Now a broader campaign is getting underway—for unconditional privatization of all fixed production capital. This intention has already been declared in the draft law on property in the RSFSR which was published a couple of days ago in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA.

How Can the People Own Property?

Regulation of ownership of property for production purposes should be started, as in the alternative draft, with people's ownership which is now conventionally called state ownership. It is just that here one should not forget that the subject of this property is the people. And the state, the state apparatus, including government organs, is only an official representative of the people, whose authority to dispose of the people's property is limited (the people make the most important decisions directly, by referendum).

It is necessary to include in the constitution that the land, its minerals, forests, and water, belong to the people and are turned over to the enterprise for pay, regardless of the kind of ownership on which it is based. The objects of public ownership are divided into the property of all the people of the RSFSR (nationwide) and the property of the people of one or another republic which is a part of the RSFSR (republic) and the property of territorial communities (communal). Within the established limits and within the framework of their competence, public property is disposed of by all-Russian, republic, and local state organs.

The predominant type of public ownership of the means of production is ownership that is realized in the form of gratis transfer of the necessary property by the state organ to the collective of the enterprise for complete collective economic ownership. The property is turned over according to an agreement which stipulates, in particular, the basic profile of the production, the norm of amortization deductions, and the norm for deductions into the fund for development of production. Otherwise, questions of the use of property, the sale of products that are produced, and the distribution of income (minus taxes) are resolved by the labor collective independently.

In branches of production where competition is proscribed or difficult, state organs exercise direct control over the enterprises with the participation of their labor collectives.

The institution of authorized collective economic ownership is intended to play the major role in the withdrawal of the state from ownership and thus in the transformation of authoritarian- bureaucratic socialism into democratic socialism. This is a key area of the left-centrist modernizing program and it affects a large part of public production. It is also the main barrier on the path of capitalist privatization. The emancipation of the labor collectives of people's "state" enterprises and their transformation into full-fledged participation in the socialist market makes privatization superfluous. Collective economic ownership is "not noticed" or is compromised by capitalist reformers precisely because it saves socialism and infuses vital juices into it.

With This Basic Law, Is It Not Out of the Frying Pan and Into the Fire...

The authors of the official draft of the Constitution of Russia see the way out of the economic crisis not in qualitative renewal of socialism but in its elimination. And they do not want to see that this will actually lead to the deepest destabilization of the economy and all life of the society and, possible, even to civil war. Really out of the frying pan and into the fire! But the real way out lies in withdrawal of the state without privatization, above all in the transition to collective economic ownership.

If within the framework of public property sold in the form of sovereign collective economic possession the alienation of the worker from the means of production and the very possibility of exploitation of man by man are precluded because the possessor and the worker are combined in one individual, with collective ownership this same effect is achieved by combining the owner and the worker in one individual. This pertains to various kinds of collective enterprises, particularly production cooperatives. It is also possible to have mixed public-collective enterprises.

The official draft constitution like, alas, the "Basic Directions," opens up the path to the creation of joint-stock enterprises, which are collective and "socialized" only in form while in reality they are private capitalist. The alternative draft, which just mentions the joint-stock form of ownership among the collective forms, unfortunately, is not very good in this regard either.

We think that economic freedom within the framework of socialism includes also the citizen's right to have an individual or family enterprise based on the corresponding form of ownership. Then in agriculture and other branches with seasonal production it is permissible to hire seasonal workers, whose number, it would seem, should not be more than twice the number of owner-workers, and the total amount of time for which they are hired should be limited to three months in one year.

If Russia is concerned about achieving economic well-being without placing the majority of its citizens under the economic and then, inevitably, political power of the Soviet bourgeoisie, almost all of whom are criminals, but rather putting them on the paths of preserving the socialist option, it—the great, independent, socialist Russia—can allow only limited private ownership. Which means that it is by no means "equal" with respect to the scale of distribution. Or it means to have the intention of getting rid of it subsequently, at the first opportunity (through purchase, of course—we have had enough expropriation!). Even now, under the conditions of the economic crisis, nobody has really proved the need for allowing private capitalist entrepreneurship, and it remains quite doubtful. The socialist market can do without private entrepreneurs; they are an alien element for it. The most it could allow—if it is guided not by the anti-people policy of privatization but by a situational alignment of forces and concern for accounting for certain regional peculiarities—is private ownership as an exception and in a limited quantity. And it must also be concerned to make sure that the private property exception does not become a general capitulation (as we know, perestroyka abounds in this).

Society can have an honest, socialistically oriented constitution. In this respect Russia could provide a good example for other republics and the Union as a whole.

RSFSR Politburo Issues Appeal to Citizens

PM2111110790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Appeal "To Communists and All Citizens of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic)" issued by the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo; date not given]

[Text] To Communists and All Citizens of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]:

Esteemed Comrades!

Our fatherland is experiencing a critical time. The transformations of recent years are unfortunately still not producing the expected results. Furthermore, political instability, the breaking of economic ties, the deterioration in the material situation of most of the population, the rise in crime, national separatism, and regional egoism have brought the country to the brink of disaster and have created a real threat of general anarchy. Alarm about the future of the state and the safety of millions of Soviet people is increasing in society.

At this difficult time the participants in the recent plenum of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission, reflecting the mood of the people, advocated immediate practical action to eliminate economic disarray, secure civil peace, and preserve the foundations of USSR state unity.

The emergency sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet at which M.S. Gorbachev, USSR president and general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, put forward radical measures for the immediate imposition of order, normalization of interethnic relations, and restoration of social accord was devoted to the problem of emerging from the crisis.

Deeply understanding and sharing the motives that guided the country's president and Supreme Soviet, we urge that they be given the most effective support. We hope that our appeal will be heard and supported by the Communists and working people of the whole of our multinational country who are faithful to the spirit of international solidarity and fraternity. We believe that without the CPSU and the active participation of Russian Communists it is impossible to implement the program for the consolidation of society.

The time has come to rise above disagreements and mutual reproaches and grievances. As always in the most difficult periods of history, our strength lies in the unity of the working class, the peasantry, and the working intelligentsia. The way out of the prevailing situation is to be found in improving the efficiency of the economy, strengthening the foundations of legality and law and order, and inflicting political defeat on the forces working toward the destruction of the union and internecine strife and discord.

Be steadfast and unwavering in defending the revolutionary gains of October, in work to increase the material and spiritual well-being of our people and to strengthen production discipline, and in creating safe living and working conditions for every Soviet citizen.

RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo

RSFSR Communist Party Joint Plenum Meets

Paper Reports Speeches

91UN0326A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 3-4

[Report by V. Mazurov and Yu. Nikolayev: "The Joint Plenum of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission"]

[Text] SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has already described the joint plenum of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission that has taken place. The report of Central Committee First Secretary I.K. Polozkov and the resolution of the joint plenum have been published. These documents provide a quite complete idea of the matters covered. Today we acquaint our readers with those who took part in the discussions. The passionate and candid statements by the comrades not only amplify the overall picture of the sharp debate that took place, but also familiarize all of us in the world with the great anxieties and the hopes of the party organizations of Russia. We shall be thinking about them and considering them carefully.

Yu.P. Belov, RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee member and secretary of the Leningrad party oblast committee [obkom]

Perestroyka, which gave rise to great hopes that our society would be freed from the legacy of Stalin and Brezhnev, has reached an impasse. People have despaired of the expectations and the promises that the crisis in the economy and in politics will have been overcome in two or three years. Social tension is growing into animosity and alarm about the danger of civil war is increasing. The populist formula—more democracy, more socialism—has cost society dear.

At this time we are experiencing a bacchanalia of political forces, with an obvious impotence of presidential power. We often hear this: We are living in a political theater of the absurd. We have been democratized to such an extent that the public need for a regime of strong personal power capable of restoring order in the country has become acute.

Quite recently, at the 28th CPSU Congress, many of us sincerely believed in the reality of the ideas of consolidation and civic consensus, defining a new role for the party as the party of social protection and constructive opposition. We have not abandoned that role, but it is not enough. Today we are convinced of the political illusion of the idea of consensus by everyone in everything. There can be no agreement with those who lust for power and propose the formation of a coalition government in order to effect a counterrevolutionary coup. We are for consensus, but with those who are for Soviet power. We are for a Soviet government and none other, whether it is one-party or multiparty.

Our plenum is a threshold plenum: Either the RSFSR Communist Party will be established, ready to avert the national catastrophe that threatens, or our party will perish at the moment of its birth. Cold civil war has become a fact in the Baltic, in Armenia and Georgia, in the Ukraine. The essence of this lies in using the soviets for their own destruction. Opposition forces, and now even those hostile to the CPSU, are pursuing a goal that is becoming increasingly obvious: to achieve a majority in the soviets by democratic means and to liquidate the Soviet constitutional system on a constitutional basis.

Many people have still failed to discern this political insidiousness. Moved as they are by the democratic soviets, they are unaware of or have forgotten the terrible lessons of history. The democratic path is not a panacea against all ills. The goal on the road, the goal of movement along it decides everything. Remember that Hitler came to power by democratic means when in 1933 he legally won in the Reichstag elections.

Today Soviet democracy is being used to choke it. And even many noncommunist people's deputies striving for civil consensus have not realized this. Neither have they discerned the danger that threatens from the recently formed "Democratic Russia" movement, which unites within itself various political forces from Christian Democrats to representatives of the Democratic Platform from the CPSU. One goal unites them: liquidation of the Soviet constitutional system. The organizers of the movement are trying to impart to it the appearance of a general democratic and general popular movement. Those among them who are outwardly moderates are laying claim to the role of bearers of democratic and common human values, and they even speak out against manifestations of anticommunism. Such statements are made. They are calculated to give the movement the appearance of a third force in public awareness, a force that is favorably distinguished from the two extremist movements—the custodians of Stalinism and the rabid anticommunists.

The "Democratic Russia" movement was created to support the draft of the new Russian constitution, in which it was not coincidental that the definition of the Russian Federation as Soviet and Socialist was deleted. In it the Soviet form of government is replaced with a parliamentary form that is essentially authoritarian but outwardly democratic.

If the Russian Communists do not recognize the danger that threatens and fail to act in defense of the Soviet constitutional system, what happened in Lithuania and is happening in Estonia and Latvia will happen in Russia—a peaceful return to capitalism with a profascist form of government. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee must appeal to the people and Communists of Russia: "The Soviet state, the socialist homeland is in danger!"

This is what is needed now:

—to demand that the president of the USSR, as a Communist, meet his civic and party obligation to act immediately to protect the USSR Constitution. The policy of compromise maneuvering and flirting with liberalism being pursued by the leadership of the country and the party is one of the reasons why perestroyka has reached an impasse. If this policy is continued, the party will be forced to find another leader and express its lack of confidence in the president of the USSR.

—to achieve immediate promulgation of a draft Union treaty and to make public all the talks held by the USSR president with the representatives of the Union republics. Only a Union treaty can become the guarantee that the integrity of the USSR will be preserved as a Soviet state. Adoption of the treaty as quickly as possible will stave off the present diarchy and dangerous civic confrontation.

—to propose to all citizens for whom Soviet patriotism is not some abstraction, but a duty, to give one's life for the Soviet motherland, that they unite in the "Soviet Russia" movement. The aim of the movement is to achieve civic unity under the slogan "For Soviet Russia as Part of the USSR!" The activity of the "Soviet Russia" movement will cease as soon as the activity of the "Democratic Russia" movement ceases.

—to offer vigorous support in the soviets at all levels for the statement by people's deputies representing the USSR Armed Forces pertaining to the danger of civil war in the event that republic national armies are formed.

—to create within the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the soviets of the autonomous republics, and in local soviets in which Communists do not have a majority, communist factions to fulfill the functions of political defense when there is the slightest deviation from the RSFSR Constitution or the USSR Constitution.

On behalf of most of the Leningrad members of the Central Committee, I ask the plenum to regard these measures as most essential.

This was the viewpoint expressed by one of the leaders of the Leningrad party organization. **The next speaker was I.M. Boltovskiy, a driver with the No. 4 Taxicab Depot in the capital, chairman of the Labor Collective Council, and RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee member.**

The document under discussion—the "Main Directions"—remains silent about the class positions of the party. What is its call to Communists? To fight or to capitulate to the enemies of socialism? Surely unprincipled maneuvering is not capitulation. Energetic actions by the rightist radical groups to create an anticommunist bloc and openly declare war on Soviet power, public ownership, and socialism are defining the features of the political situation. The reactionary movement is being developed in the soil of a rapidly moving reverse process of class formation. Under conditions in which antagonistic classes are being formed, can Communists pursue a head-in-the-sand policy of avoiding political struggle?

In the monograph "Capitalism at the Turn of the Century" (it is a "brick" of approximately 30 printed pages), published in 1987 and permeated with the April wind and the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, distinguished scholars wrote that present-day capitalism is primarily exploitative in nature and essentially antihuman and misanthropic because, as previously, it preserves the dominance of capitalist ownership. Can the workers be free under the conditions of an antihuman system? Of course not. Hence, freedom is a class concept. There can be no doubt about the nature of capitalism. The monograph was prepared with the help of other authoritative scholars, like comrades I.T. Frolov and G.Kh. Shakhnazarov. One is a former aide to the general secretary, the other is a present aide. And the collective of scholars was led by corresponding member Comrade A.N. Yakovlev, who is a member of the Presidential Council. Convincing the reader that socialism, which has freed labor from exploitation, is not the result of ideological self-deception, the authors draw attention to the global problems that testify to the impasse nature of the capitalist road. After examining the state of capitalism and concluding that it is incurably sick, Comrade A.N. Yakovlev and his colleagues conclude that "the planned system of the socialist economy create the conditions necessary for resolving global problems," the chief of which is, as is known, freeing man from the trammels of private ownership.

Today, three years later, member of the Presidential Council Comrade A.N. Yakovlev is essentially claiming that socialism has lost in the historical competition with capitalism. The following question arises: Why has he changed his attitude toward common human values, such as the authority of science, honesty, and sense of principle? There can be but one answer: The interests of the scholar are one thing, but the interests of a policy that expresses people's needs, on which he relies, is another. No, no lofty principles lie at the basis of the actions; it is not ideas that rule the world but specific interests resulting from class position. Comrade A.N. Yakovlev has betrayed the interests of the workers; that is the reason for his metamorphosis. The example cited here shows that highfalutin words do not always reflect people's true interests. It is only among the working class and in the labor collectives that words match their aspirations.

The question of class position has become particularly acute in connection with the market reform under the president's program and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's draft RSFSR constitution. We have been assured, and are being assured, that the switch to the model linked to the market will not change the nature of society. Now we are becoming convinced that the draft antisocialist constitution, which contains no trace of anything either Russian or Soviet, is essentially an attempt at an Americanized state coup, and is the logical outcome of the market reform.

Today, many people are rediscovering the truth that politics is a concentrated expression of economics. The openly bourgeois nature of the proposed constitution has revealed the bourgeois nature, carefully concealed from the people, of the economic transformations whose basis is a political struggle for power....

For all who hold the motherland dear the time has come for decisive action. Civic peace at any price is in fact becoming a "velvet" revolution. And to put it plainly, it is one more betrayal of the people, one more counterrevolution. Some people are claiming that the party is doing nothing because its arsenal of theoretical and practical means to fight for the ideals of socialism is exhausted. In their opinion the party no longer exists. This is a lie! It is doing nothing because it is demoralized by the lack of any real party leadership. We must finally admit that the CPSU has been virtually decapitated....

Communists expect decisive action from the RSFSR Communist Party leadership. The resolve to arrive at a recognition of the authority of its policy. The authority to win through its work in the masses and not just sit there in the marble trenches of Staraya Ploshchad. There is no firm position. This can be seen from the document up for discussion. There is no class position, and there will be no policy that meets the interests of the workers. There will be spinelessness and acquiescence.

I propose that the plenum consider the following basic principles and tasks instead of the vague draft of the "Main Directions." Basic principles. The RSFSR Communist Party stands at the positions of the working class; it defends the interests of the labor collectives, which unite workers, collective farm workers, employees, and the intelligentsia; it advocates control of the national economy, whose main subject is the labor collective, not the private entrepreneur (the labor collectives must become the owners of enterprises without payment of redemption money); it acts decisively against the sale of land and housing to private persons; it fights for the sovietization of public life, from enterprises to society as a whole; it fights for the power of the labor collectives but not for the power of Communists.

The workers' councils are regarded as the cementing nucleus of the Russian Federation and the Union of fraternal republics.

Today it has become clear to the workers that no one will defend us except the CPSU. But for this the party must engage not in the writing of drafts but concrete matters. The people expect business from the Communists!

Yu.V. Petrov, CPSU Tomsk Obkom secretary, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee

In this very complicated situation the party has been disarmed theoretically, in the sense that the prospects for movement for it today are unclear. What road are we treading? Despite the formal affirmation of the socialist choice made in the Program Statement of the 28th CPSU Congress, the question remains open. The affirmation has certainly not been underpinned in practice. All subsequent development, and also the 500 day program adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the "Main Directions in Stabilizing the National Economy and the Switch to a Market Economy" adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet give the people no reason for thinking that these steps are aimed toward socialism.

Accordingly, my proposal amounts to this: The RSFSR Communist Party action program should contain a concise formulation of the idea of socialism and the specific practical work to realize it should be outlined. I draw attention to this because in the 9 October RSFSR Supreme Soviet appeal "To the Citizens of Russia" and in the draft Constitution of the Russian Federation concepts such as "socialism" and "socialist state" are deliberately omitted and in their place we have the concepts "Russian state" and "Russia." This is being received with pain by the people since the socialist idea has become part of the national culture, imparting to it a spirit of social justice and social protection for the individual. And what becomes culture does not perish.

If it wants to remain with the people, the party must understand this. In reality, the party has been removed from work on and the adoption of economic programs and has been forced to accept them post factum, that is, whatever has been proposed. Moreover, the party is being used as a cover to adopt a program to restore capitalism. In order to extricate the party from this paradoxical situation and false position, the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee must clearly define its own position in this matter: How do we see the future of our society—socialism or capitalism? It is essential to give rank-and-file Communists the opportunity to express their attitude toward the prospects for development.

It is high time that the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee present itself to the CPSU in such a way that when strategic paths are being decided for development its voice will be weighty and decisive, if you will. Therefore, on issues of principle, such as the market, privatization, and selling off land, the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee should sponsor a referendum. But these issues of principle should not overshadow the main issue, namely, what kind of society do we want to build? With the aid of the market it is possible to build both socialism and capitalism. When the referendum is held it will be essential to keep in sight the fact that the market is not an end but a means for the social restructuring of society.

In a situation in which political forces have emerged capable either of restoring capitalism or of correcting the mistakes made in the socialist movement, it is essential to ascertain the specific nature of the present stage through the concept of the "transitional period." And so, before talking about "humane democratic socialism" it would be worth clarifying the specific essential nature of the transitional period. During this period the great diversity in the economy will inevitably give rise to social stratification in society, and each social group will try to gain power. If Lenin moved toward state capitalism during the period of NEP [New Economic Plan], it was only when the socialist state had secured firm positions. But today the situation is one in which the workers do not have power (in the soviets). The soviets have been engrossed in a struggle against the CPSU. The CPSU is the political force that has always acted for socialism, and still does, and expresses the interests of the working man. Therefore, if it leaves the political arena, the idea of socialism also goes. To be replaced with what? Already they are proposing privatization, selling off, free zones, a labor market, and premonopolistic private ownership. The new party united in the "Democratic Russia" bloc has set for itself the goal of eliminating the CPSU. As a matter of principle it is rejecting any kind of compromise and speaks out categorically against any kind of cooperation with the Communists.

The models of socialism that have been realized in the past and the market programs being formulated today proceed from purely international principles without taking into account the role and importance of national specific features and variants. However, what is common to all mankind can exist only in dialectic with the national. Moreover, a country and a nation are viable only when they are part of the world civilization as they bear along their own national idea. Thus, what is common to all mankind is also a unity—a unity built on diversity....

The specific proposal is that the RSFSR Communist Party action program should be national in spirit and proceed from the cultural and historical traditions of the Russian people. Today, everyone is talking about the rebirth of Russia. But most often, by this they mean filling the stores with goods. It must be solidly recognized that without a spiritual rebirth no economic program can be realized.

And finally, practical realization of the ties between the RSFSR Communist Party and the working class and all workers in the republic could be a congress of workers and peasants at which all the topical issues of the day relating to the prospects for development of our republic and country, privatization, the selling off of land, and so forth could be discussed. I think that the working class and the workers could answer those questions without mistakes.

What do party members, first and foremost worker Communists, expect from this plenum? This is the opinion of K.P. Urishov, a turning lathe operator from the Penza Electronics and Computer Production Association, RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission member.

The main task for our plenum is for us to leave it with a precise and clear document relating to the position that we have today, and what we want and where we are going, and along which road, and the theoretical and practical baggage that we shall present to Communists and, indeed, all people. So that when we get back we can say: This, people, is what we have decided, this is what we adopted, this is what we want to do. Support us, help us, accept this, and we shall work correctly in the future, and we shall do this for you, not in words but in specific deeds.

This is all the more necessary now, when our life is characterized by exceptional complexities, when the entire country is now up on its hind legs with hackles raised, when our people—our hardy and patient and unassuming people who have lived through many economic and political cataclysms—have reached the point where they may sweep away the entire party and government and the soviet movement, all together. This is the reality, comrades. And so the fate of the party, and this means the fate of socialism, will depend on whether or not we succeed through concrete deeds, achieving general agreement and cooperation with other parties and movements, in showing the correctness of the road that has been chosen, and in uniting society on this basis. Otherwise we shall be forced to yield up the right of leadership to other, extreme parties and movements, many of which, as we know, are trying to remove our party from the political arena and make the people of Russia the subject of another experiment that will at the same time destroy all the traditions and principles built up by society over the long tragic and heroic years.

I am convinced that we regard this scenario as unacceptable for us. But then Communists must be sure that the party of which they are members is taking a clear and precise stance on all the issues that are worrying people, and that it not only talks about satisfying their demands but acts.

Alternative drafts to the draft Main Directions for Activity submitted by the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee had also been drawn up. These were also debated.

V.S. Lipitskiy, sector chief in the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee

Concern about the fate of fulfillment of the instructions from the Constituent Congress regarding drawing up a program document prompted us, a group of members of the CPSU Central Committee and the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission, to start work on our own draft. It was subsequently published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA under the title "Draft of the Initiative Group." Several days later, when the official appeared in the press, we saw that a considerable proportion (up to about one-fourth) of the ideas and proposals that had been expressed in our document had been included in the official text. However, the differences that remained and that you can see when you compare it with the other version, are fundamental.

In the field of economic policy: Whereas the official draft contains a declaration of support for the switch to the market with real emphasis on centralized forms of management and planning, the draft of the initiative group not only emphasizes the need for orientation mainly on economic efficiency, but also sets out the specific directions for work by the primary party organizations under the conditions of the switch to the market, that is, precisely for what the document is being created. The first question being raised now at all the meetings in the labor collectives is this: "And what are the primary party organizations to do now that we no longer have to discuss the percentage of plan fulfillment?" We have tried to give an answer to that question.

In the political sphere: The Secretariat document expresses the general thrust toward consolidation and readiness to cooperate with various political forces. In our draft we have gone farther by specifically naming the political forces that could become our allies at this stage,and we have named those whose ideas and intentions objectively match the aims of the Communist Party.

Finally, the field of internal party life: In contrast to the general declarations in the official draft, a new model is offered for internal party relations, together with specific demands for the new arrangements in the party at the present stage. And this is the main factor: It is proposed that preparations be made for a congress of the RSFSR Communist Party in 1991 in order to resolve questions pertaining to its program and statutory documents and resolve the sensitive issue of membership in the republic party organization—an issue that is evoking mass dissatisfaction among Communists.

Now Communists are often being reproached for the fact that they have been occupied with internal matters and that among them everything is being reduced to some kind of disagreements, the preparation of alternative documents, and so forth. Comrades, we must look the truth in the face. The party is not now working as it should be working, not because people are unwilling to do this, not because we or the representatives of the Leningrad initiative movement or on the Marxist Platform are of bad character and we can in no way get along together, but because a party in which there is no internal ideological unity and no internal definition, a party that has not decided on its own basic program position, cannot work. It is not internal party dissension! And I disagree totally with the assessment made in the conclusion of Ivan Kuzmich's report to the effect that we must simply shake hands with each other and agree to some kind of truce. If this happens, we shall remain in a state of inactivity, removed from real political life. Most Communists have still not passed through the crucible of inner ideological self-determination. This is a stage through which it is essential to pass, and the forging of a common party program will help this.

I believe that we are obliged here at the plenum today to reach a decision on preparing a program for the RSFSR Communist Party, and to decide on a schedule for its adoption at congress, no later than next year. It is all essential to confirm the composition of the groups that will start preparing different versions of that program on a competitive basis.

As we have already said, this was a statement by one of the authors of the alternative, or, more accurately, initiative draft action program published in MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA. The view of the representative of the Leningrad initiative congress was somewhat different.

V.G. Dolgov, department chief in the sociology faculty at the Leningrad State University

The prevailing opinion that when they embarked on perestroyka, its organizers did not have a concept for the changes that are taking place seems incorrect. The unfolding of events shows the clear logic and enviable purposefulness of those who lay claim to the "new" thinking. That this concept, and a clear plan, was not made public is, of course, another matter. It is also natural that they were worked out behind the party's back. In our country, however, although tardy, communist patriotic forces did recognize these insidious plans before it was too late. And through their political and organizational activities they are bringing them to a halt. These forces also include the movement for the rebirth of the RSFSR Communist Party. This is why right from the start this movement has been so torpedoed and checked and pushed off to the side.

Establishing the RSFSR Communist Party is proving difficult. A campaign is being waged by rightist forces, ardent anticommunists and anti-Soviets, and the obvious and not so obvious members and supporters of other parties to discredit the party itself and its leadership. But it does no good to complain about the blows being dealt us, the political party of the Communists that has entered the arena of the fight for the interests of the workers. A fight is a fight.

The more vital task is to sort out our own internal life and eliminate and deal with our own mistakes and defects, and to strengthen ourselves theoretically and organizationally. And here, we must cure ourselves of the ills and habits inherited from the CPSU that have led us to this sorry state and brought us to the verge of disintegration.

We have much to overcome. It includes the isolated and essentially high-and-mighty stance assumed by a leadership grappling with its first leading duty. It includes the neglectful attitude of the party leadership toward the party masses. It includes the underestimation of theoretical work in the party, as a result of which many are succumbing to various kinds of crude and sometimes simply false doctrines packaged in bright new deceptive wrappings.

All these old diseases have to some degree been seen in the situation with respect to work on the RSFSR Communist Party program documents. Just consider the historic decisions of the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress in June. It was stated unambiguously that an action program would be prepared immediately. A preparatory committee worked on this for two months. However, during the second stage of the Constituent Congress in September there was a disappointing loss of tempo in the establishment of the RSFSR Communist Party. As the result of certain manipulations, the action program was removed from the agenda. Even though, and I stress this, no one spoke out against the need to have an action program. Of course, not all the provisions had been accepted. But the need for an action program was recognized by everyone. And suddenly there was a resolution reducing the matter to some kind of Main Directions.

The development of the political situation over the past two months shows that the June Constituent Congress and the Preparatory Committee were right. Now we need a concrete action program. And this is what is being talked about at the numerous meetings in the primary party organizations.

In general, two lines can be discerned in the establishment of the RSFSR Communist Party. Those representing one of them—very influential figures—did everything possible to insure that there was no RSFSR Communist Party. When that failed they fell back to new defensive perimeters. It could be founded, but no Central Committee should be elected, or if it were elected, it should not be complete, and the first secretary should not enjoy the conditions necessary for effective work. Establishment of an action program should be frustrated. Totally removed from the agenda. Downgrade it merely to some basic directions. Leave the party without a press organ. Better hold a second congress and, after re-electing a leadership, try to nullify the communist movement in Russia.

The party masses, first and foremost in the far-flung oblasts and rayons of multinational Russia, are pursuing a different line. They immediately raised the question of creating an RSFSR Communist Party on solid ground. We believe that it was precisely thanks to this general line that establishment of the RSFSR Communist Party is not being extinguished but is growing, although slowly. The "Initiative Communist Action Program" was born within the framework of this line.

The "Communist Action Program 'for the Rebirth of Soviet Socialist Russia'" is being submitted for your consideration. This program was adopted by the Initiative Congress of the Communists of Russia on 21 October this year, representing 2.5 million Russian Communists in 10 autonomous republics, five krays, and 40 oblasts. We propose that the Initiative Congress has to some extent justified the interruption permitted in September in the matter of adopting party program documents.

And so, today the RSFSR Communist Party has two program documents—"The Main Directions in the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party," which still has to be discussed at this joint plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission, and the initiative "Communist Action Program 'for the Rebirth of Soviet Socialist Russia.'" There are several other scenarios for resolving the existing situation.

First, there is a democratic scenario. Comrade Lepitskiy has proposed that these documents be submitted to an all-Russian party referendum. Second, an extraordinary congress or all-Russian party conference should be convened and there, in fair debate, we can decide what the party needs—the "Main Directions" or the action program. Third, we should find a possible combination of these documents.

We have carefully studied the "Main Directions" and we find there much that is positive and correct, and the structure of the document is progressive. However, it talks only about directions for movement. Some goals of movement have been stated, but unfortunately there is no definition of the process of movement itself. And dialectical materialism teaches that the only true goal is a goal that is adopted along with a process for achieving it. In the proposed document questions of tactics, sequence of actions by the Russian Communists over time and space, and specific measures are virtually absent. Accordingly, to adopt only the "Main Directions" at this time would mean leaving the party with no tactics, frozen in position, even though pointed in the right direction.

The initiative communist action program is to some extent a concretization and expansion of the "Main Directions," a document in which tactics are set forth for Communists under present conditions.

Our proposals are specific and constructive. In order to avert the disintegration of the party, overcome anarchy, and deal with the usurpation of power by shady persons and compradors of all stripes, it is proposed that Communists, having immediately recognized the reasons for the crisis in society, act to restore Soviet power in Russia, and, that means, in the USSR. That they move to set up workers' committees in all the labor collectives as primary cells of Soviet power, and on this basis create workers' soviets at all levels. And to do this while it is still not too late, while the production forces in the republic have still not been finally destroyed by privatization and the cities and the countryside threatened with hunger and cold. The workers must take control of plants and factories, collective [kolkhoz] and state [sovkhoz] farms, institutes and higher educational institutions, transport, and the institutions of culture, public health, and education, and must safeguard them. And those Communists who act with initiative to engage in this historical work will preserve themselves as Communists, preserve themselves as people, and preserve the party and Soviet power and socialism, and, as a result, our great Russia.

Every speech had its own spirit, as they say. But it is understandable that they listened with special interest to the emissaries from the primary organizations.

V.V. Kozlenkov, party committee secretary at the Kuybyshev "Progress" Plant, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee

Our country continues its slide into economic chaos. The situation is catastrophic. Traditional economic ties have been broken. Labor discipline is falling with each passing day. The legislative enactments that have been passed are leading the state enterprises to bankruptcy. The switch to the market that has been proposed in these conditions, and whose implementation has already been initiated, is the road to bankruptcy for the entire country through a final unbalancing of the economy. Switching to the market without the availability of goods, without specialists trained to work under those conditions, without a base for retraining redundant workers, will plunge our country into the next catastrophe. And no one any longer believes the assurances given by the country's leaders that social safeguards will be provided.

Communists and nonparty people greeted with joy the election of M.S. Gorbachev to the post of general secretary in 1985, and they believed in him. Then the general secretary became the people's deputy from the party, and then president of the country. Communists again chose him as their leader, and all the reins of power are in his hands. But everyday Communists and nonparty people are asking this question: Is he capable of leading the country and the party, and in whose interests is he pursuing his policy? And there are grounds for asking this question. They stem from the divergence between words and practical deeds; political inconsistency is leading to political instability in the country....

We, the Communists of Kuybyshev Oblast, support the draft "Main Directions" being discussed today, and we believe that it is high time for the RSFSR Communist Party leadership to move on to concrete action.

Adoption of the extremely serious 500 days program in just one day is not adventurism, it is criminal. A great deal in the program can and should be adopted. But in general, in the form in which it has been adopted, it is antisocialist, antipopular, and anticonstitutional, because it proposes abandonment of the guaranteed right to work and creates conditions for inflated retail prices and the enrichment of some strata of society at the expense of others, and is fraught with the danger of an explosion of crime, drug addiction, and other antisocial phenomena. We, the Communists of Russia, cannot assume responsibility for the consequences of this program.

Perhaps some people will today think my statement is too sharp, but I, a party member with two years of seniority as a party committee secretary, represent a plant at which several thousand people work, and where one worker in five is a Communist. I represent a plant that during the war years started to produce the IL-2 ground attack aircraft only a month after the evacuation. The plant that developed the "Energiya" carrier rocket, the plant that is now the pride of our country. And this unique plant is disintegrating before our very eyes thanks to the mindless so-called conversion, which has put our plant into convulsions. Under these conditions the RSFSR Communist Party is obliged to take a firm position with respect to the conversion being carried out, and to preserve such unique enterprises, for they are our future....

A.Ya. Nemtinov, Moscow party city committee secretary, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium

During the course of the two months of work on the draft, it has, I believe, undergone significant changes. It has become more democratic, more radical, and the "Main Directions" are now in line with the general direction of our party's movement as defined by the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress. In my opinion, a major role in this has been played by the meetings in the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee with scholars, economists, and social scientists, and also the work of the initiative group in the party aktiv. The document that has been submitted has given due consideration to the proposals of the initiative group. It should be emphasized that with respect to a number of its positions the draft from the initiative group is better. It is more succinct and smacks less of slogan-mongering. It not only defines goals, but also the mechanisms to reach them and the work in the primary party organizations. I think that during further work done on it by the editorial commission, it would be possible to restore those provisions.

The "Main Directions" being dealt with today represent only the beginning of the RSFSR Communist Party's work. It is an "open" document. It requires that at the local level we all determine specific priorities and plans.

The Moscow city party organization is submitting its own action program to the second stage of the city party conference. The title of one of the sections in it indicates the assessment of the situation: "To Extricate Us From Crisis and Prevent Catastrophe." It is now being sharply discussed in the party organizations.

The "Action Program" sets forth a number of specific measures to provide social safeguards for Muscovites and their civic rights, and to stabilize the national economy of the city and preserve its intellectual and cultural potential and close the party ranks.

Much is already being done. Contacts are planned with the Moscow city soviet, which is not rejecting the severe criticism of a number of its ill-considered decisions, including the decision to change street names. And you are aware that MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA has carried a number of pieces on that subject. But much depends on the state of affairs in the country, in the RSFSR, and in the party, which is now the only, I would even say last, framework remaining to preserve our shaky statehood.

I think that the "Main Directions" adopted today can help stabilize the situation. It is just that they must be immediately underpinned with priority concrete steps.

What must be done? First, we must focus attention on the work of Communists in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Their voices are still not being heard. Decisions are being made there today that can alter the foundations of our system. On the eve of the republic's Second Congress of People's Deputies we have the adoption of a constitution. The responsibility of the Central Committee for these decisions is extraordinarily great. It is essential that the party Central Committee occupy clear-cut positions with respect to Russia's switch to the market, and that it find points of contact through Communists with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and determine specific ways in which it is possible to help.

The RSFSR Communist Party is obliged to make a constructive contribution to work on the Union treaty and the preparations for the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on that issue, and to develop cooperation between the republic's Communist parties. The RSFSR Communist Party must and can become a basis for consolidation of the CPSU, a connecting element that will prevent the Union and Russia from disintegrating into individual princedoms.

We must think about the future. If we succeed in defending the processes of democratization and holding out for economic reform, the center of our attention will be shifted to parliamentary work, and to territory. Now, following the election, there is again a vacuum. The winners have moved on to the soviets, and many are reluctant even to report back to the electorate. The Communists must fill this vacuum. It is essential to start studying the science of the election struggle even today.

N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission

The forces that today oppose the CPSU and the RSFSR Communist Party, which is an integral part of it, are innumerable. Dozens, hundreds of political movements and trends are active in the country. But sociological studies show that those movements and trends contain only six or seven percent of the independent population. The CPSU is not only the biggest political force but also a force that is well organized, with well trained cadres and powerful intellectual potential. Remember that millions of people are linked to the party of the Communists, not only by the disappointments but also through the democratic transformations, revolutionary traditions, and solid aspiration for the democratic ideal.

The "Main Directions in the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party" have been received with great interest. In terms of meaning this document is designed to play the role of a unique Ariadne's string pointing out the road to a life of dignity for the people of the Russian Federation and the affirmation of social harmony and justice. A major step has been taken compared to the action program rejected by the Constituent Congress. The document is more succinct and more specific and at the same time more substantial and more meaningful. But it is common knowledge that no limits can be set on perfection. And in this regard permit me to indicate some of the most vulnerable points of the "Main Directions."

First, it is a clearly expressed "complicity syndrome." What, for example, is the RSFSR Communist Party going to do to establish civic peace and national agreement in the republic? Let us read it: "support in every possible way," "promote," "help" virtually everyone and everything—the workers' movement, the peasants' movement, the women's movement, the ecological movement, and other movements. Consciously or unconsciously the RSFSR Communist Party thus presents itself not as an independent, vigorous political force, not as a party of action, but a participant, a fellow traveler, and so forth.

The second dangerous syndrome is the "syndrome of goal setting." Goals, goals, goals—and very few roads leading to those goals. So that all the programs are built on the principle of "what is to be done?" rather than "how are they to be done?" and Russians, and not only Russians, are interpreting this with distrust, to say the least.

Nevertheless, comrades, the above remarks notwithstanding, the "Main Directions" do have a conceptual foundation. Let us express our thanks to the creators of the document and let us adopt the document as a foundation.

As we do this, we should consider the following. We have seen many programs, good and bad. What we need is action, action, action. As far as the alternative versions are concerned, I would like to say this: The Central Control Commission will be happy to work zealously to insure that the voice of the minority be heard. We shall strive for glasnost and help to publish the various alternative drafts, statements, and so forth. But it is very important that this voice not lead to a split in the party or to senseless confrontation that saps the strength. Thus, the idea of convening a party congress next year would seem to pursue goals that are quite good, and it is in line with the acute nature of the moment. The more so since you will recall that there was a period in history when party congresses were convened almost yearly. But that was the period of civil war. It was necessary for the ultimate victory! Let us work; people expect this of us.

Today it is essential to raise the question not of winning but of regaining the authority of the RSFSR Communist Party. What is needed to raise it to the proper level, to a level that is a match for having the moral right to call it the ruling party? Without claiming to have the last word in answers, permit me to express just a few opinions.

The first and main thing is that we must find our place in the political system in the Soviet Union and the Union republics. We must clearly define it and occupy it. That place is neither below nor above the soviets, not far from them, and precisely in the organs of popular power at all levels. While we destroy and reject the totalitarian past, we must not move to confrontation with the soviets. We must work, work, work, remembering what Lenin said: "Where we do not work, others will."

Initiatives from Communists in the legislative organs of power should be solid, well-considered, weighty. And here, the entire intellectual potential of the party must be mobilized immediately to help communist parliamentarians. There may be differences between the RSFSR Communist Party and the republic Supreme Soviet, and they may hold different positions, but this should not be senseless and lead to the impasse of confrontation.

The local soviets need our unremitting attention. Questions concerning the role and nature of the local organs of popular power are today evoking a range of different opinions, from total absolutization of their importance to replacing the soviets with other structures based on quite remote Russian tradition, like zemstva, for example.

It should be borne in mind that today public support will be forthcoming only to a party that resolves the question of ownership correctly, in the interests of the majority of people. And here, the question of the commercial, so to speak, activity of the RSFSR Communist Party arises. Opinions vary on this. Right up to the point of banning its involvement in commerce. I think that this is not quite correct. The party organs must themselves seek out assets and not exist only on the membership dues of Communists.

And finally, if we are laying claim to the role of ruling party, then we must state this clearly and find the right method to solve the many very acute social problems that we have.

The pain of the remote areas of Russia spilled over in the statement made by Hero of Socialist Labor I.S. Punayev, a vehicle operator from the "Novaya Zhizn" in Ryazan Oblast and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

Fate has determined that I live and work on the land of Ryazan, he said. And so for more than 40 years I have driven combine harvesters and worked the levers of tractors. I have carried my party card next to my heart for a quarter of a century. And I tell you honestly that today it is difficult for a man from the land, a man of the plow, to trade unions, to understand where in the flow of eloquent words the truth ends and the lie starts. This is what we are examining. But we are allowing ourselves to be distracted from urgent matters. We are not accustomed to the rumble and roar of machines, but what is poured down on us every day from these rostrums evokes confusion and bitterness, and most of all indignation.

I am a Communist and so everything that is happening with the motherland and with the people and party pains my soul. Some contend that we have never had socialism here, and do not now, while others are rushing headlong toward capitalism. They see themselves with the whip and reins, and the peasants of Russia between the shafts. This is why we have observed with hope and approval the organization of the RSFSR Communist Party and its program document. It contains many fine words and correct thoughts. It is understood that it is not a set of instructions that tells what should be done and how it should be done. It is only a first furrow. It indicates direction. Each person must decide for himself how to plow it and what to sow.

With each passing year those of us whose destiny has been linked to the destiny of the Russian non-Chernozem grow fewer in number. It must be confessed that both it and we have suffered much from violent commanders and the adversities of the weather and our own negligence. But the heart of the peasant has never throbbed so, his soul has never been so weary. He wants to shout aloud to the armchair experts who in 500 days want to organize some evil reapportionment of the countryside. Open your eyes, good sirs and comrades. You may destroy the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and bring them to their knees, but you will not increase the amount of grain and meat for the people.

I fear only that they will not hear me. Those in the Supreme Soviet have no time to take counsel with the people. And I reason thus: Just free us from the muddleheaded officials and you will see that our farms can operate as well as farms in the West.

The desire of some leaders who have come to power to drive a wedge between the city and the villages is very alarming for rural workers. This year's harvest work has shown that the countryside cannot live without the city, and even more, the city cannot live without the countryside. The plantations of vegetables that were not harvested will be a reproach to those who instead of helping offered invitations to meetings and inflamed passions at the empty shelves in the stores, hurling accusations at all Communists and acting on the principle that slander is like mud—if you throw enough some of it will stick.

I read the newspapers and I see in their struggle they stop at nothing, and often sink to direct insults directed toward the party leadership. I sometimes think that perhaps it is to our benefit that they are fighting us in such an organized and fierce way. It means that they sense our strength and we should be afraid if this does not happen. People who have lived in the countryside know that you do not pay attention to a barking dog and you do not show fear, you show strength and confidence. Then the dog will be quiet and run off like a coward.

And finally, comrades, the thing that is a real source of concern. The people's deputies of the RSFSR have received the draft of a new constitution. Even the very name of the constitution is that of another republic. Some people are very eager to replace the power of all the people and of the workers with the power of a narrow circle, the power of businessmen who are quite ready to call themselves, if not landowners and the bourgeoisie, then something else, some name that is more civilized. I understand that there is a strong desire to expunge from people's memories everything good that has been gained in these years.

The problem of the mass resignation of Communists from the party also received attention. This, for example, is what was said on the subject by N.G. Bindyukov, rector of the Novgorod State University and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

I make reference here only to an analysis of the Novgorod Oblast party organization. As at 1 January 1990, it numbered 51,168 Communists. Since the beginning of the year that number has declined 11,447. The first wave of resignations from the CPSU ranks took place in March through June, during the period of the precongress debates. Most who left the party ranks were those who considered themselves "ballast," who had joined the party by chance, had been accepted because of the schedule, and had long since abandoned their responsibility for the state of affairs in the party organizations, and who considered themselves slighted for some reason. The reasons for the resignations of some people at that stage also included ill health and advanced age and the concomitant inability to participate actively in the work of the primary party organizations. However, the mass resignations from the party, at any rate with us, started essentially after the 28th CPSU Congress.

During the period that has elapsed since then 6,540 people have left the ranks. They are made up of 51 percent workers, one percent kolkhoz farmers, 37 percent employees, and 11 percent pensioners. And here the main reason was the following: dissatisfaction with the congress decisions, although, as interviews with those Communists show, as a rule they are even now unaware of the congress decisions. They seized on a particular thesis from the newspapers and repeated it endlessly, but did not really know what the congress' decision was. And then there are those who were dissatisfied with the slow resolution of the tasks of providing the population with housing, food, and industrial goods, and with the price increases, crime, and speculation, the declining prestige of the CPSU, the lack of concise positions in matters of stabilizing the situation with respect to the party leadership, the campaign of disparagement of the party apparatus, and the growing anticommunist sentiments and extremism.

It is very difficult, comrades, even using sociological methods, to single out one further reason, but nevertheless it does exist: It is the fear of a definite proportion of Communists for their own families and children. Because certain actions have been carried out by a number of people in this regard—threats, throwing bundles of burning paper at the doors of Communists who showed activeness.

O.I. Vetin, first secretary of the Kotovsk city party committee, Tambov Oblast, and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, offered his assessment of the "Main Directions" submitted for discussion.

In general, it is a professionally prepared discussion document. Without belittling its worth, I would like to focus on the shortcomings and the reasons for those shortcomings. The draft "Main Directions" are not in line, either in form or in spirit, with the initial idea of creating a document capable of mobilizing Communists to specific action. It contains an abundance of passionless formulations and is divorced from the concrete historical situation. In other words, today's stern realism is replaced with theoretical abstractions. I say candidly that the draft that has been submitted for debate has failed to stir any response in the soul of Communists in our city party organization.

The focus of activity by the party and its leading organs should be on today's very acute problems, and on specific action. Take the open debauch of anti-Sovietism. The draft contains not a single word about that. The seriousness of the opponents of the Communist Party is not in doubt, but we are essentially passive accomplices and silent supporters. We should not forget that you and I are responsible for the party. And today, as at no other time, it needs defending.

In the present clamorous situation, I take no comfort from the relaxing tone of the document telling me that the Communist Party will "offer initiatives" and that "the party organizations will help" and "Communists will support," and so forth. Saltykov- Shchedrin's "dried vobla [a Caspian roach] doctrine," which was derided in its time, appears through these lines: "It is never necessary to speak real words because they seem flawed. But you perceive that words are emptier, and begin to twist them. And twist and twist.... Then the emptiness itself recedes into the background and the one little dried vobla of truth is all that remains."

In my opinion radical renewal requires an idea of what the party is. As the preamble of the draft notes, from an organization that defends the interests of the workers it should become the party of the workers themselves. I understand that this is a long-term step. For today the workers and peasants have no strategic initiative; it is the growing class of entrepreneurs that has them. I propose that instead of a thesis to the effect that "the party organizations reserve for themselves the right to engage in actions and campaigns...." we add the clause from the "Political Position of the Communists of Leningrad" that the party occupies a position of constructive opposition in those cases in which state policy is at variance with the interests of the workers, in which destructive forces penetrate the institutions of state power and launch an offensive against civil rights and the freedom of the individual. With all the consequences in the strategy and tactics stemming from this.

What is the meaning of the campaign unleashed against the CPSU?

S.K. Mironov, first secretary of the Leninskiy rayon party committee in Astrakhan city, and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, tried to draw the serious attention of those present to the state of affairs in the primary party organizations.

Confusion persists in the primary party organizations. What is the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee doing in this situation? As a representative at the rayon level, I say that, in our opinion, apart from the wonderful article by Comrade Antonovich, we feel no real influence. Perhaps as it recalls the power of the party masses, the Central Committee expects an avalanche of ideas and an avalanche of actions from below, and is assigning itself the role of accumulator of those ideas? I am sure that at the present stage we should not expect that avalanche. Today the Central Committee must assume that heavy burden. It must become the generator of the ideas and actions on which the actions of the lower elements must charge themselves. Only after that will it be possible to reckon on any reverse current.

What am I proposing? That our plenum resolve to assign the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo the task of drawing up within the month specific recommendations for tactical actions by the primary party organizations under present conditions, and pass them on to the local level for practical implementation. I believe that these recommendations should indicate the actions to be taken by the party organizations during the switch to market relations, in de-state-ization of enterprises, in providing social safeguards for enterprise workers and their families, in cooperation between the administrations, labor collective councils, trade union committees, and other organizations, and in defending the name and cause of Lenin. I repeat that today these kinds of tactics are urgent and essential.

It is no secret that recent work in the party committees at all levels has been largely paralyzed because of the reorganization of the structure associated with the 50-percent cutback of workers in the apparatus. Now it would seem that the reduced apparatus has been defined and we can act more energetically. But it must be said that yet one more function has been added to the party committees, namely, commercial activity. And if this is done at all levels, from Central Committee to the party raykom and even the primary party organization, then I fear that we may share the fate of the Komsomol. This activity can become paramount and we shall be transformed from a political organization into an economic apparatus that exists only for itself. In order to prevent that I believe that it would be advisable for party committees from oblast level up to engage in commercial activity and use it to provide for the financial viability of their own party committees and the city and rayon committees. To this end the CPSU Central Committee and RSFSR Communist Party could provide the corresponding committees with long-term, interest-free credits or loans to start this work. and the party. We need to emphatically rebuff the threats of

V.Ya. Azarov, chairman of the Moscow Oblast Council of War and Labor Veterans and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, talked about today's difficulties in the country and the problems associated with the switch to the market.

It seems to me that the chief ills of our state have occurred and are occurring because we have failed to comply with the basic principle of socialism, namely, from each according to his abilities, to each according to his labor. And this in an absence of exploitation and private ownership. What will happen during the switch to market relations, which are the foundation of man's exploitation by man? In this connection, I would like to deal in particular with matters pertaining to social safeguards for the working man under the conditions of the market, first and foremost low-income people—veterans, students, large families, and other low-paid members of society.

Overall no one now objects to the need to switch to market relations. The entire question is how can it be effected with the least social cost? Hence the need for an urgent, official definition of a state minimum living wage, but as of today this has not been forthcoming. Some say that the figure is 70 rubles [R], others R90, while the trade unions say R130.

The next question is how privatization is done. There are many declarations on this, but none on the actual system and methods by which it will be realized—those associated with safeguarding the interests of the workers. Attention is also drawn to the fact that the labor of past generations is not taken into account in most of the ways proposed.

Today there are 60 million pensioners in the country, and about another 10 million people who are of pre-pensionable age. These are the people largely responsible for the creation of all the national wealth existing in the country, which, according to figures from the USSR Central Statistical Administration [as published] was R4.3 trillion in 1989, including R2.8 trillion of fixed capital. And here we are all perfectly well aware that their value is three or four times lower than prices in the world market. This is something that every should think about.

During privatization each person should receive the share of the national wealth coming to him in accordance with his work seniority. Only if he receives this can a person be an equal participant in the newly created economic system.

Many people are talking about economic crisis in the country. I am not a doctor or academician. And this is probably why I do not understand what this crisis is. A large harvest has been grown. There are no epidemics or wars. There is a surplus of manpower resources, production capacities are being underutilized, we are effecting conversion, more goods are being produced. But the stores are empty. It seems to me that the source of our crisis is the result of incompetent economic management, a sharp decline in labor and technological discipline, and rupture of economic ties, and also the adoption of a number of ill-considered decisions, that have led to the discredit of the socialist economic system.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, and the Council of Ministers of Russia have already adopted an entire series of necessary decisions, but why have their leaders failed to put in place a mechanism to move consumer goods and foodstuffs along the chain directly from producer to consumer—the people? This would make it possible to explain why goods that are now often being produced in greater volumes than before are not reaching the consumer, and then reasons for the continuous shortages would be clearer, and who was to blame, and what steps should be taken.

In this connection the explanation from the republic leadership that the Center is to blame sounds, to say the least, unconvincing. And this is now starting to be understood by the electorate, which is rightly asking this question: Who are these people to whom we have entrusted the leadership?

In his speech, A.F. Chaykovskiy, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, RSFSR deputy, and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet subcommittee on issues relating to repressed peoples, talked about the work of communist deputies in the parliaments at various levels.

We have heard justified reproaches here addressed to the RSFSR communist deputies. I can say without exaggeration that this is difficult for us. Let us ask honestly whether we were all ready to fight together under the conditions of the multiparty system. This is probably the first time since 1917 that we have had this experience. There was no expert assessment to help us. We were not born Parliamentarians with a capital "P." We had to become parliamentarians.

Some of us really were intimidated by the roll-call vote. I will tell you candidly that there are people who were shaking. They were shaking because of accusations made by the press, they were shaking because at the local level no support was forthcoming at a difficult moment. Remember those lists that were printed in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. And on some issues on our republic's sovereignty the majority was right. In particular with respect to clause five of the supremacy of laws, some 300 people voted against it. Why? It was because we could foresee the anarchy that would come to the local level, how executive discipline would deteriorate and so forth. As a result we in the Supreme Soviet are adopting an urgent document on the strict subordination of lower organs of power to higher organs of power.

Or take, for example, the law on property, which has already been through its first reading. During the second reading it will be more difficult to vote it down, and in practice it will be possible only to alter formulations. But this law contains very little on leasing, on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, or on state enterprises. It deals mainly with private ownership.

I think that we should nevertheless support everything that is progressive and advanced. But on issues of principle we do not have the right to give in. In particular, I believe that the sale of their enterprises to workers or kolkhoz farmers on a leasehold basis or as their own property is not a violation of the socialist principle. It is the purest kind of Marxian thesis on state ownership. It is ownership by the collective itself. But we cannot give this to the mafia or sell land to foreigners without a war.

And here is another analysis of the Action Program. V.M. Tikhonenko, a leader of a brigade of forging shop personnel at the "Krasnodarselmash" production association and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, expressed his opinion.

There are evidently as many opinions as there are people in the hall about the basic draft that has been submitted for our consideration today. When I took it up to read, I probably tried four times to get through it. When I asked my comrades they said: Yes, there is nothing new in this. If, of course, we look at it from the positions of the workers. What does this draft offer us for their lives? Of course, we can work on this draft today and tomorrow or for 20 years, editing and re-editing it. But if we look specifically at what urgent problems it resolves—providing foodstuffs and housing and essential goods—and what role the party plays in this, then, of course, everyone will throw up their hands in dismay. Because this is a very complex task, and even in the labor collective where I am the chairman of the labor collective council, it is a complicated matter to solve. And it is even more complicated for the party today. But if anyone says that the party is walking away from finding solutions to these question, then he is a very ignorant person.

The party must exert influence through the party cadres. Unfortunately, however, the party cadres—those who in their time moved up to the party leadership—are today trying to move away from this. This is why when you meet Communists and converse with your comrades at conferences, plenums, and meetings, they say that there has been enough talk. If we cannot solve the food problem, let us at least bring some order.

I believe that we must revive workers' control. It has been dissipated. And take under control the entire production process, from the manufacture of agricultural products and consumer goods to the final consumer.

I believe that if, in the immediate future through our own efforts and the efforts of the people, we do not bring order to the way in which these problems are solved, then people will also lose their faith in the party, not just the government and the President. And while we are adopting these programs and working out solutions, our life is not improving.

During the course of the plenum the question of the party mass media was raised repeatedly. It was also raised in the speech by L.G. Kalinina, editor of the newspaper MOSKOVSKIY STROITEL and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

The party of the Russian Communists has now been in existence for almost six months and we are still only getting ready to discuss issues relating to the press at the next plenum. But it would seem that it is precisely with the establishment of newspapers that the Communist Party should start its activity. A party that is silent is doomed. This is the basic issue in political struggle. Therefore, the inactivity in this direction by our Central Committee Secretariat is causing bewilderment, to put it mildly. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee has partly won over one newspaper—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA—but this is little enough. As before, the Communists of Russia have only a poor idea of the RSFSR Communist Party. Hence the many bewildered questions, hence the possibility for indiscriminate disparagement of our party by the pseudodemocratic and essentially anticommunist press.

An acute political struggle is taking place in society. They are trying to discredit and destroy the Communist Party. In the new newspaper KURANTY, which, incidentally, is being published in the printing house of the party publication MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, we can read an open appeal to ban the Communist Party and institute a ban on a number of professions for Communists (No. 5 dated 18 October 1990).

How are we to understand it when Comrade Prokofyev, the first secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Moscow gorkom and CPSU Central Committee Politburo member, obligingly offers the capacities of a party publishing house to the anticommunists from the newspaper KURANTY and the Moscow soviet gives the go ahead to evict a newspaper with a communist orientation—MOSKOVSKIY STROITEL—from the printing house?

I suggest that it is high time to understand that until we have a mass press we shall be unable to bring our views and our action program to the attention of Communists or ordinary citizens. At this moment I see no obstacle against the immediate creation of a press for our party.

The speech by V.A. Tyulkin, party committee secretary at the Leningrad "Avangard" scientific-production association and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, was topical and critical.

These forums are interesting for you and me, comrades, the Russian Communists. The congresses and plenums are combative and the decisions that we reach are democratic; yet we all know that fairy tale of Malchish-Kibalchish: Everything is just so, but something is wrong. And everything seems fine, but something is not.

I go along with all the "why's" heard in the speech of Ivan Kuzmich. And it must be noted that today he has taken a very important step for himself. That is fine.

Comrade Belov appealed to us: It is essential to demand that the general secretary turn the wheel. Well, should this be tried? Of course it must. However, our general secretary and president is not working as a cabdriver, like Comrade Boltovskiy, and there the wheel does not have to be turned. I do not have much faith in the prospects for this undertaking. Because today at this RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Plenum we should first and foremost be looking at what is going on in our party. And what is happening primarily is that the party is without a position of program. We must draw constructive conclusions.

I disagree with those comrades who have approached the question of party resignations so calmly. The resignations are massive, and it is not just the worst people who are quitting. And now they are quitting because they do not wish to share the responsibility for the next failures, which will occur in the very near future. And if we agree with Comrade Ivashko about what is happening in the party, then we must add that the party is being purged "of workers." Our party will be dealt the latest blow in the near future. Things will get worse, enormously worse. And so, of course, it is now very important to adopt a document that people can understand.

We must demand from communist deputies that they comply with the instructions of the 28th CPSU Congress that we do support all forms of ownership and management that do not permit the exploitation of man by man, and that the party will use all methods to oppose legalization of the shadow economy.

I believe that it is high time, no matter how difficult it may be for us, to adopt a resolution on the mandatory formation of communist factions in the soviets at all levels, and not just factions, but factions with an internal discipline and with a mechanism for interacting with appropriate party organizations and committees.

Yu.N. Yegorov, a brigade leader at the Moscow "Skorost" Machine Tool Plant and member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, shared some joyless thoughts on perestroyka.

A fundamentally qualitatively new stage in the country's development has started—the stage of the formation of a new state under conditions of a real multiparty system, total political pluralism, and very keen political confrontation between the various forces. The country's foreign policy position is also ambiguous. The end of the cold war in Europe and the world has undoubtedly generated a sense of relief among the people. But where is the guarantee that following the dismantling of the Berlin wall the concept of the inviolability of the European borders will not also crumble?

At the same time I call for support for the task that is set in the "Main Directions," namely, to correct and continue perestroyka. It is essential to make our economy a mixed, three-sector economy.

The process of effecting sovereignty on the theses of the spiritual revival of the numerically small peoples is in full swing in the country. But this process cannot be brought to a conclusion until sovereignty has been established for the Russian people. From this rostrum I would like to proclaim the slogan "The Gathering and Unification of the People on the Principles of Agreement in the Name of the Revival of the Russian People." Let us work to realize this by uniting the Russian people. It is precisely Russian conciliarism and the community traditions of the Russian people that constitute an historical adequacy for the socialist principles of self-government.

* * *

In the mail received by the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress Preparatory Committee when preparations were being made to hold that congress, and in the mail sent to the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee since the congress, there are more than 45,000 comments and proposals regarding the publication of an RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee action program.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo thanks all those who sent in their comments and additions for the draft Action Program, and also the proposals relating to the organization of work in the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee.

They have all been carefully studied and analyzed and taken under advisement during preparation of the draft "Main Directions in the Activity of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee," and they will be considered during the process of practical activity by the RSFSR Communist Party leadership.

Commissions Established

PM2311125790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A joint plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission was held in November. The following Central Committee standing commissions were formed:

—on problems of party building, Comrade A.N. Ilin, member of the Politburo and second secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on humanitarian and ideological problems, Comrade G.A. Zyuganov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on socioeconomic policy and links with the workers movement, Comrade A.G. Melnikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on agrarian policy and links with the peasant movement, Comrade V.I. Kashin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on work with public associations and ethnic and youth policy, Comrade I.I. Antonovich, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on problems of the women's movement, Comrade N.P. Silkova, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman;

—on ties with Soviets of People's Deputies, Comrade A.S. Sokolov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee as chairman.

At the first sittings of the commissions there was a multifaceted exchange of opinions on the content, forms, and methods of party organs' activity in present-day conditions. Statutes on the Central Committee commissions and plans for their work were discussed and adopted. The structure of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee departments was ratified.

Resolution Adopted

PM1611164590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

["Resolution dated 15 November 1990 of the Joint Plenum of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission 'On the Current Situation and Basic Guidelines of the RSFSR Communist Party's Activity'"]

[Text] 1. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission share Communists' alarm in connection with the deep crisis in the country and the republic, the growth in antagonism and confrontation between political forces, the sharp fall in discipline and law and order, the growth in crime and corruption, and the dangerous drop in people's living standards.

The shortage of prime necessities, unparalleled in recent times, the threat of a cold lean winter and unemployment in the cities, and the uncontrolled speculation under conditions of the paralysis of the authorities cannot be justified merely by references to previous periods of our history.

The country and society, riven by ethnic, separatist, and regional contradictions and the ambitions of certain power-hungry political leaders, are heading toward a social catastrophe. Appeals for civil peace and concord are not achieving their aim.

The main obstacles on the path to the stabilization of society are the shadow economy, bad management, crime, and people's lack of responsibility for the fate of the fatherland and the state at all levels.

There is a real threat that the USSR will disintegrate and that the socialist achievements of the Soviet people will be eliminated. In this crisis situation, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Council of Ministers frequently duck vital questions of people's survival and often promote a further fall in discipline. Laws and resolutions adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR Government are not being fulfilled. The president of the country is not using his emergency powers.

The confrontation between central and republic organs of power is weakening the existing political system still further. In many areas of the country blood is being shed, the flood of refugees is increasing, and there is a threat of civil war.

In the face of this, the forced transition to the market with its emphasis on developing private enterprise and the legalization of the "shadow economy" which were started without consulting the people, may have disastrous consequences for the whole of society.

The sidelining of the party from the adoption of fundamental decisions undermines the prestige of the head of state, reduces Communists' trust in the CPSU leadership, and increases the flow of people leaving its ranks.

2. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission consider the process of the party renewal to be unjustifiably protracted. Inconsistency and opportunism, an unprincipled attitude in the ideological struggle, and timidity in defending political and moral positions are causing confusion among Communists and preventing them from successfully countering the anti-communist opposition, which is trying to squeeze the CPSU out of public life and to forcibly change the constitutional order of the republic and the country. Decisions and appeals for the withdrawal of party organizations from enterprises, institutions, the Army, the KGB, and the law enforcement organs, are aimed at this.

Antisocialist forces have seized many mass media and are manipulating public awareness. The commercialization of culture is being encouraged and a real threat to the spiritual legacy, historical traditions, and moral health of the people is being created.

In this most complex situation, the party is not collaborating properly with the workers' movement, the peasant alliance, youth organizations, the international movement, the intelligentsia, and other active supporters of the renewal of society who uphold the concept of socialist choice. Attacks on the name and cause of V.I. Lenin and the historic achievements of October, and abolitionist and splittist sentiments among Communists are not being decisively repulsed. The ceaseless reorganizations of the party apparatus are leading to the loss of cadres of competent party workers.

3. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission state that they actively oppose the policy which is leading to a deterioration in the situation of working people and the disintegration of the USSR, and they believe that party organizations are entitled to, and must demand that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the president of the country fulfill the decisions of the 28th party congress which confirmed our socialist choice.

A real threat to turn the RSFSR into a nonsocialist, non-Soviet, and undemocratic republic virtually unconnected to the USSR by any obligations, can be found in the draft of the republic's new constitution prepared for the second Congress of RSFSR people's deputies. This is an overt effort to give constitutional form to a coup d'etat which could change the social system and create a totalitarian state with a pseudodemocratic facade.

4. The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission believe that strong soviet power is needed in order to preserve a single state

system and guarantee tranquillity and civil peace. The plenum appeals to party committees, party organizations, and all Communists of Russia to play a vanguard role in the stabilization of the situation in the country and in leading it out of the crisis.

Given the critical nature of the current situation, we believe that it is a vital necessity to form communist factions in soviets at all levels and instill in them internal discipline and a mechanism for cooperation with relevant party organizations and party committees.

We appeal to all soviets of peoples deputies, parties, sociopolitical organizations and movements, and all those who are not indifferent to the fate of the USSR, to strictly fulfill practical measures proposed by the country's president during the stabilization period, and to declare a moratorium on rallies, processions, strikes, and acts of civil disobedience in this emergency situation.

5. In accordance with the instructions of the constituent congress and taking into account the discussion that has taken place in party organizations and the plenum, "The Basic Guidelines of the RSFSR Communist Party's Activity" are to be ratified. A commission is instructed to revise them, taking into account the observations, proposals, and initiative programs of party committees, Communists, and nonparty people, and bring them to the attention of all Communists.

Party organizations should be guided by this document when determining concrete guidelines and plans for their work on the basis of local conditions and the current situation.

The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission appeal to Communists, workers, peasants, the intelligentsia, and all people living by their labor with the words—be vigilant! You alone can strengthen the Soviet state and guarantee the power of the working people!

Our strength lies in good organization. So strengthen it. Guided strictly by socialist legality, take control of production, distribution, and law and order. Recall deputies if they prove undeserving of your trust.

Only labor collectives and people of labor can save Russia, the USSR, and society from destruction and internecine strife.

Working people of the republic unite!

Polozkov Holds News Conference

PM1911112590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Russian Communists' Action Program"]

[Text] We are ready to cooperate with any political movements if their actions are aimed at uniting society and helping the country out of the crisis, I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, stressed at a press conference in Moscow 16 November. The news conference was dedicated to the results of the joint plenum of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission held in the capital.

The first secretary talked about the main provisions of the republic Communists' action program adopted at the plenum. It is designed to run for a short period which, in I.K. Polozkov's words, is due to the impossibility of long-term planning in conditions when the situation in the country and the republic is changing constantly. He stressed that the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party still adheres to positions of the socialist choice of social development and supports the processes of perestroyka and democratization taking place in the country. In its work the Russian Communist Party is oriented toward the CPSU's course and supports the Statutes and Basic Guidelines of the activity of the country's Communist Party.

The participants in the news conference talked about the fundamentally new directions of the Communist Party's activity. These relate primarily to the newly created Central Committee commissions which will work on interparty ties, ties with the workers' and peasant movement, and parliamentary activity.

The news conference considered shortcomings in the Russian Communist Party's work. They include the slack work of the republic's main political force, which has around 10 million citizens of the RSFSR in its ranks, and the slow formation of the Russian Communist Party's central apparatus.

CP Central Control Commission Holds Plenum

PM2111104590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Central Control Commission Plenum"]

[Text] A plenum of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Control Commission was held on 16 November. Leaders of control bodies of republic, kray, oblast, and Moscow city party organizations and workers of party educational and scientific establishments, newspapers, and magazines took part in its work.

The plenum discussed the following items:

1. The role and tasks of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission in conditions where the party is undergoing renewal.

2. Organizational questions.

Comrade N.S. Stolyarov, chairman of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission, delivered a report on the first item.

The following took part in the debate: A.I. Sazhin, chairman of the Arkhangelsk Oblast party organization control and auditing commission; A.Ya. Nemtinov, secretary of the Moscow city party committee; V.A. Tatyanikov, secretary of the party committee of a Sverdlovsk industrial rubber products plant; G.G. Gusev, senior engineer in the Production and Technical Administration of Kuybyshevskiy Rayon Soviet, Moscow city; V.I. Saranskikh, first secretary of Vologda party obkom [oblast party committee]; V.I. Yermakov, assistant professor at Chelyabinsk State University; V.I. Tulinov excavator operator at the Stoylenskiy Mining and Enrichment combine, Belgorod Oblast; N.A. Kulikova, secretary of the Khabarovsk Shipbuilding Plant Named for the 60th Anniversary of the USSR; V.F. Kostyukevich, secretary of the Murmansk party obkom; N.F. Bykov, secretary of the Party Commission of the Political Department of Troop Unit 19612; Yu.G. Terentyev, secretary of the party committee of the "Arsenal" Production Association, Leningrad city; A.O. Barinov, head of department at the Chita State Medical Institute; V.V. Borisov, secretary of the party committee of the Central Machine Building Scientific Research Institute, Kaliningrad city, Moscow Oblast.

The following resolution was adopted on the item under discussion.

The plenum confirmed the status of a member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Control Commission, the Regulations governing the Standing Commissions and the Presidium of the Central Control Commission, formed standing commissions, and confirmed the structure of the Central Control Commission apparatus. Comrades A.Ya. Nemtinov, A.Ya. Vlasenko, and A.P. Dumachev were confirmed as leaders of Central Control Commission standing commissions.

The plenum elected Comrade P.Ya. Slezko as first deputy chairman of the Central Control Commission and Comrade N.F. Katkov as deputy chairman.

Supplementary elections for the Central Control Commission Presidium were held and the following comrades elected: N.F. Bykov, A.I. Vladimirov, V.A. Dolotov, V.I. Yermakov, O.Ye. Kutafin, G.M. Mulyukov, R.I. Nesterov, A.V. Khomenko, and A.P. Shadrin.

Comrade A.N. Ilin, member of the Politburo and second secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the RSFSR Central Control Commission Plenum. Comrade G.G. Veselkov, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission, and Comrade N.P. Silkova, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the work of the plenum.

Communist Party's Ilin on Party Policy

PM2111155990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

["Topical Interview" with A.N. Ilin, Politburo member and second secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, by unnamed PRAVDA correspondent; date and place not given: "'We Have No Right To Temporize'"]

[Text] The PRAVDA editorial office has recently been receiving many letters in which Communists and nonparty people express concern at the "taciturnity" of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee. This at a time when, in their opinion, opponents are attacking the party from all sides and sometimes, not sparing the black paint for the purposes of compromising it, even maintain that it is "worse than the plague." Why is no decisive rebuff dealt to these attacks?—readers ask. In this connection many of them inquire how the process of forming the party's leading organs is going, what difficulties are being encountered, and what the positions and approaches of the Central Committee Politburo to resolving particular problems are. PRAVDA's correspondent asked A.N. Ilin, Politburo member and second secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, to answer some of these questions.

[PRAVDA] As is known, the decision to form the RSFSR Communist Party was adopted by the Constituent Congress in June this year, and its leading organs were finally formed in September. Of course, this is not really long enough to draw any conclusions on its work. Nevertheless, scorching critical arrows are already being loosed at the Communist Party. Do you think, Aleksey Nikolayevich, that such a massive bombardment is justified? Or is this a perfectly normal phenomenon under conditions of glasnost and pluralism of opinions?

[Ilin] Objective criticism is undoubtedly of use to everyone, and we only welcome it. It is another matter when it is supplanted by all sorts of ploys and suffers from a set nature or overt ill-will. Some people, for example, dislike certain individuals. Although this is a matter of taste, as the saying goes, but what has this to do with the whole party? Blatant prejudice. The reasons for ill-will probably lie elsewhere—in our stance. And this is one of loyalty to the socialist choice and the communist perspective. This is not to some people's liking.

As for the anxiety and perplexity of the general public with regard to the Central Committee's "taciturnity," I cannot share it. It should be acknowledged that it has taken a long time to organize the Communist Party. The more than two-month gap between the stages of the Constituent Congress proved a very painful period: The full-fledged Central Committee had not been formed, and only the action group of the preparatory committee was working virtually along voluntary lines. Until recently the newly formed party remained "voiceless" and was without access to the mass media.

Difficulties arose over the formation of commissions, the Central Committee's working apparatus, and the budget and over material and technical support for the republic party organization. In addition, the elected Central Committee Secretariat was able to start work with a full complement only toward the beginning of October.

[PRAVDA] Difficulties are, of course, inevitable in the process of formation, Aleksey Nikolayevich. But what has been done already, and what contacts are being established between the Central Committee and local party organizations, particularly primary organizations?

[Ilin] The efficient activity of the Central Committee and of the whole party largely depends on reliable links among its organs at all levels. Our position here is one of making the most frequent possible visits to the provinces—above all, to primary party organizations, which are called upon to really become centers of political work.

Secretaries of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee have recently visited more than 20 republic, kray, and oblast organizations. They had approximately 50 meetings directly in primary organizations in Moscow City and Oblast alone. There is a great need for similar contacts in the provinces. It is proposed, in particular, following the conclusion of the reports and elections, to carry out prompt training of secretaries of primary party organizations and of rayon and city party committees.

We are also faced with the task of bringing the whole structure of the republic party organization into line with the realities of the day. Now, for example, it is extremely important not only to preserve and enhance party influence in labor collectives but also to considerably strengthen our organizations at places of residence. In addition, we intend to eliminate superfluous links and to reduce the number of staff workers.

I also wish to single out the following aspect. The development of the sociopolitical situation in the republic predetermines the role of the Communist Party as the assembler and uniter of all healthy forces and movements. We will master the art of creative cooperation with other parties if this is in the interests of the working people and of our common cause.

However, the reality today is such that some of our opponents do not hide their intentions of squeezing the Communist Party onto the sidelines of political life. Unfortunately, there are also forces undermining the party from within. Can such a thing be tolerated? I think not. Therefore I believe that Communists should give serious thought to whether it is admissible to keep within their ranks, particularly during the present crisis period, people who are virtually working against the party. But this is when methods of persuasion and dialogue no longer work.

A party which wishes to consolidate and strengthen society must consolidate and strengthen itself. Therefore, in developing the process of the democratization of internal party life and supporting a very broad diversity of opinions, we must not cross the line beyond which party organizations and committees could turn into discussion clubs and lose their militancy and capacity for vigorous action.

Today, more than ever, it is essential to restore the Leninist understanding of the principle of democratic centralism—freedom of debate when discussing questions, and unity of action after adopting decisions.

[PRAVDA] After the constituent congress, to judge from reports in many mass media, increased attempts were made to discredit the RSFSR Communist Party, to prevent its development, and even to "outlaw" it. What does this mean? Some people are inclined to maintain that the Russian Communist Party with its rigid "class line" and intolerance of dissidence was to blame for everything, while others charge that the RSFSR Communist Party was created without consulting Communists. Is this so?

[Ilin] Our opponents are sly and try to forget everything that preceded its formation. Let us recall how it was in actual fact. Russia's Communists firmly posed this question: Why have Communist Parties been created in all 14 republics, but not in ours? Why do the new movements and parties, which are only just coming into being, already have republican structures, while we do not? Why was there a Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks during the first years of Soviet power, but not now?

You probably know that the CPSU Central Committee Bureau for the RSFSR was created in the fifties. An analogous bureau reappeared last year. How did Communists respond to that "innovation"? Very simply: Some 80 percent of the party's members who were polled said that it was necessary to create a full-blooded RSFSR Communist Party. Precisely 69 of the 72 oblast, kray, and republic party conferences noted this in their decisions.

So our party was formed, above all, on the initiative and at the demand of the party masses.

There are other "arguments" too. It is alleged, for example, that the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR Communist Party set itself up in opposition to the 28th CPSU Congress. But the congress of Russia's Communists firmly declared that we will be guided in our work by the CPSU Program Statement and Statutes adopted by the 28th party congress. As for the "class line," we do not hide the fact that Communists have come out and will come out for the interests of the working class, the peasantry, and the labor intelligentsia.

In our view, the claims that the creation of a party of Russian Communists will weaken the CPSU and intensify separatist trends are also groundless. The Statement and the other documents of the constituent congress unequivocally point out that the RSFSR Communist Party is a constituent part of the CPSU. Being international in essence, it advocates the preservation of the integral USSR as a multiethnic state and close, permanent cooperation with the union republic Communist Parties.

[PRAVDA] Aleksey Nikolayevich, it is an obvious fact to everyone that negative trends in the economy of the republic and of the whole country are continuing to gather momentum. Economic convulsions are affecting more and more spheres. What, in your view, are the main causes of these crisis phenomena? And what role in stabilizing the economic situation does the Central Committee Politburo allocate to party organizations?

[Ilin] The RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo fully shares the anxiety of working people in connection with the worsening socioeconomic situation. We have probably gotten really close to the fateful line beyond which total paralysis of the national economy could ensue. Certain leaders of the republic try to account for the economic failures as follows: The old management system has been dismantled, but the new one has not yet started working. But I will venture to ask: Was it really sensible to throw out in such haste the management systems created over 70 years, albeit imperfect ones, without creating anything to take their place?

The realities are grim. We must make a sober assessment of them. In this situation Communists have no right to temporize or to evade resolving vitally important problems. Our paramount aim is to use political methods to promote in every possible way the restoration of economic ties, the observance of contract discipline, and the enhancement of responsibility for failures and abuses.

I would like to emphasize once again that the stabilization of the economic situation is the chief task. Without resolving it, we will fail to ensure a normal transition to the market.

As is known, the 28th CPSU Congress advocated a phased transition to market relations. The RSFSR Communist Party must now determine its strategy and tactics and its place in this great work. It is here that important questions arise. Particularly if you take into account the confrontation that has arisen between the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets.

As for Communists, in my opinion they cannot have two opinions. Our position has been clearly defined: We favor a transition to market relations within the framework of the socialist choice which rules out man's exploitation of man. We also take an unambiguous stand on the question of ownership—a key question from the viewpoint of the socialist or capitalist path of development. I repeat: We must not rush headlong, regardless of realities, from one extreme—excessive centralization—into the arms of the private businessman. Therefore, while supporting the policy of reducing state control over ownership, the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo gives priority to its collective forms.

We intend to act from this viewpoint in connection with the specific decisions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers on the transition to a market economy. If these decisions meet the working person's interests, we are ready to promote their realization.

Our position is also clear with regard to land ownership: The Communist Party will oppose the sale of land to private hands. We also consider it necessary to champion the peasants' exclusive right themselves to determine the forms of management and to have control over the results of their labor.

In short, people must be masters of their destiny and thus have a thorough knowledge of the whole truth about the transitional period, including about the market. About all its pluses and minuses. This is not some kind of magic wand that can be waved to instantly change life for the better. I, for example, just cannot understand why the hiccups in the economies of East European countries which have embarked on the path of market relations are hushed up. We all have to go through a difficult science course accompanied by inevitable mistakes in order to be "enrolled" in the parameters of the world economy and rise to its highest marks.

We cannot be impassive onlookers in questions of the privatization of property either. This work must be carried out under the working people's control. Our property belonging to the whole people cannot be allowed to end up in the hands of dealers in the shadow economy or foreign "competitors." Communists will also keep in their field of vision the elaboration of a system of measures guaranteeing social protection and justice for all categories of working people. The coming problem of unemployment, including at enterprises of the defense complex subjected to conversion, merits special attention here. It is paradoxical that specialists with the highest qualifications could be left without work, as I saw for myself during a visit to Udmurtia and Kuybyshev Oblast.

The Central Committee intends to put corresponding legislative initiatives to the republic Supreme Soviet on this paramount problem. Active consultations with specialists are now taking place. Recently, for example, there was a representative meeting of Central Committee members with social scientists. In short, people themselves are suggesting to us ways to resolve important tasks, and we do not speculatively invent areas of activity for the Communist Party. They are determined by life.

To repeat: We will not succeed in surmounting the economic crisis either in the immediate future or in the longer term if separatist sentiments prevail in oblasts, krays, and republics. On this question we fully share the concern which the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has shown recently at the growing threat to the Russian Federation's integrity.

[PRAVDA] Readers rightly say: It is not enough to accuse opponents—it is necessary to conduct a more active search for paths of mutual understanding and cooperation with other organizations. What do they have in mind? As far as we know from conversations with Communist RSFSR people's deputies, the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee still gives them little practical assistance.

[Ilin] Yes, this is an important problem. Steps must be taken toward each other here. A consolidation of efforts and sincere mutual assistance are needed. In addition, the abandonment of Article 6 of the Constitution objectively demands a revision of the forms and methods of the party's activity in the soviets. Unfortunately, the activeness of Communists in many of them is low. And their voice is hardly audible in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

It is hard to explain, for example, why our legislators often carelessly adopt unconstitutional acts. Take the laws "On Ensuring the Economic Basis of RSFSR Sovereignty" and "On the Operation of Acts of USSR Organs on RSFSR Territory." Whatever they might say, they were adopted under conditions of the operation of the RSFSR and USSR Constitutions and the absence of the new Union treaty and merely increase instability in society.

We are now actively making up for lost time. Meetings between members of the Central Committee Politburo and people's deputies are becoming traditional. They are being given assistance in organizing consultations and studies. Other top-priority measures are also being implemented with regard to work with Communist deputies both at the center and in the provinces.

[PRAVDA] The extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is approaching. To judge from the agenda, the central issue there will be the adoption of the Russian Federation's new constitution. It is known that its draft has been prepared, and readers inquire about its contents. Have you been able, Aleksey Nikolayevich, to familiarize yourself with the draft and, if so, how do you, a USSR people's deputy, assess it?

[Ilin] I have, and the first thing that struck me was the lack of any continuity with the preceding RSFSR constitutions. It is essentially a totally new fundamental law, more accurately the legislative enshrinement of a different social system that is alien to Soviet people.

What is offered in exchange? Speaking of the basis, what is meant is capitalism in its "primordial" phase. The political superstructure, according to the authors' design, is to be totalitarian authority with unlimited powers for the president.

This question suggests itself: Can the RSFSR Communist Party and its Central Committee contemplate this impassively? Of course not. Here we count, above all, on the common sense and principledness of all deputies.

The unprecedented scale of anticommunist propaganda is no less dangerous. Instead of making an objective analysis, the majority of the mass media fling mud at our history, traditions, and truly socialist values. Working people, people of military valor, and those who have devoted their lives to selflessly serving the homeland have "vanished" from the pages and screens. The cunning slick operator, who knows how to lead the "good life," is elevated to the ideal. All possible publicity is given to the charms of a social system under which everyone is for himself and God alone is for everyone.

It should be acknowledged that under the conditions of the new realities of life many Communists have proved to be unarmed ideologically. Having resolutely abandoned the stereotypes and cliches of the past, we have stopped half way, as it were, in the restructuring of ideological work and merely opened the "floodgates" for wholesale criticism. This is a high price to pay for long years of quotation mongering and dogmatism.

[PRAVDA] The draft Basic Guidelines for the RSFSR Communist Party's Activity were published recently. How have they been perceived by Communists? Are you sure that the Central Committee plenum will adopt this document? And do alternative drafts exist?

[Ilin] Many people have noticed substantial differences from the previous version. To a considerable extent this is a result of the fact that approximately 40,000 comments and suggestions sent to the Central Committee were generalized when it was reworked.

The first responses indicate that, on the whole, a quite dynamic, constructive document has resulted. In the main, it expresses the common positions of Russian Communists on a range of the most urgent problems and gives party organizations the necessary ideological and political guidelines for work. This is also evidenced by its consonance with other drafts, particularly of the group of members of the CPSU Central Committee and of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee and Central Control Commission and of delegates to congresses, the Moscow and Leningrad conferences, and also the third stage of the Initiative Congress in Leningrad. Although many specific comments and suggestions are coming in, on the whole we are counting on support for the draft Basic Guidelines of the RSFSR Communist Party.

As soon as it has been adopted, it is necessary to embark without delay on vigorous actions to realize what is planned. Too much time has already been wasted on debates. The moment has come when, to use V.I. Lenin's words, every practical step is more precious than a dozen programs.

RSFSR Congress Agenda Changes Criticized

PM2711124190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Letter from RSFSR People's Deputy S. Glotov, member of the Constitutional Commission, under the rubric "People's Deputy's Letter:" "'Constitutional Maneuvers'"]

[Text] Having read in Saturday's issue of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA (24 November) the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolution "On the introduction of changes to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet 25 October 1990 resolution 'On convening an extraordinary congress of RSFSR people's deputies,'" I discovered to my surprise that the fourth point of the proposed agenda had been hastily altered.

Instead of the question of the RSFSR Constitution and the work of the Constitutional Commission, which had figured earlier for discussion, it is now planned to discuss only the draft RSFSR law on changes and additions to the RSFSR Constitution.

Of course, changes to the current RSFSR Constitution need to be made; moreover, in my view they should be of a radical nature. I had to say this at least twice in my speeches at the sitting of the Constitutional Commission, of which I am a member. But it is utterly incomprehensible why the report on the draft changes to the current Constitution should be delivered at the congress by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet committee for legislation, while by its 16 June resolution the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies assigned this to the Constitutional Commission.

This decision was also made by the Constitutional Commission itself at the 12 November plenary sitting: "Submit to the Second Congress of People's Deputies the draft law 'On changes to the RSFSR Constitution (Fundamental Law)' and the draft RSFSR Constitution."

Why is the Constitutional Commission being deprived of its rights?

As far as I know, the changes to the current Constitutions should have been prepared by a specially created working group by 22 November. Unfortunately, when they registered the deputies did not find this draft law in their documents files.

Now this applies to the draft of the new Russian constitution.

As is well known, on 12 November, in addition to the draft prepared by the Constitutional Commission working group, two other drafts were submitted at the plenary sitting of the Constitutional Commission: a draft prepared by the "Russian Communists" initiative group and a group of experts (published by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 November) and a draft prepared by scientists from Saratov's D.I. Kurskiy juridical institute (the leader of the authors' collective was Professor and Doctor of Juridical Sciences V.T. Kabyshev).

The question arises: Surely the people's deputies and voters have the right to know how work is proceeding on the draft of the new RSFSR Constitution, especially as in its resolution "on some questions of preparing the draft RSFSR Constitution" the First Congress also gave this assignment to the Constitutional Commission?

Another question also involuntarily arises: Why and for what have "constitutional maneuvers" been undertaken even before the start of the congress? Why has the question of the work of the Constitutional Commission been removed? Of course, not everything has been successful in the work of the Constitutional Commission.

The basic principles of the draft of the new RSFSR Constitution have not been discussed widely and openly in the press and among the population and there has been no referendum.

All attention has been focused on preparing the new draft constitution, and changes to the existing Fundamental Law were "forgotten" until November.

Nor have we fulfilled our own decisions on holding a competition for the best draft, yet, as was stated at the commission sitting 12 November, 39 works have come in. These works were not seriously analyzed until very recently and by 1 November their authors had not received written decisions (as stipulated in the provision on the competition). That was not allowed even at the time of "double-dyed stagnation."

Nor did the draft RSFSR Constitution prepared by the working group meet with a high assessment (rather the reverse).

On 1 November, during its discussion in the republic Council, the majority of speakers did not recognize it as the last word in Russian constitutional thinking and voiced very serious complaints. And a number of sessions of oblast soviets which discussed the draft RSFSR Constitution produced a negative conclusion, stressing that it is far removed from the people's interests and is in a hurry to abolish Soviet power in Russia.

But, of course, that should not mean that there is no need to discuss the question of the work of the Constitutional Commission at the congress. Rather the reverse, it should unfailingly be put on the agenda.

'Communists of Russia' Hold News Conference

PM0612144590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by A. Ryabov: "Resurrecting Russia Together; News Conference by Communist Deputies"]

[Text] What is the "Communists of Russia" deputies' group and what aims do its participants set themselves and how exactly do they structure their work at the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies? A news conference of representatives of this group held yesterday was devoted to answering these questions.

The group was created during the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies in accordance with the Congress ruling on creating deputies' factions and groups, the group's cochairman, Russian People's Deputy A. Sokolov, secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, stressed in his introductory speech. Here the Communists have united at their own initiative, without any prompting from any one or an order "from above." At the time about 400 people were registered in the group, and that number has remained virtually unchanged.

The "Communists of Russia," despite their opponents' attacks, enjoy support from the majority of RSFSR people's deputies. For instance, at the group's initiative, supported by the participants in the extraordinary Congress, the question of the attitude toward the Union treaty has been included on the agenda. Incidentally, 932 people's deputies voted for that proposal.

Eleven cochairmen form the leadership of the group. This is a collective body that elaborates the tactics and strategy of legislative activity. It includes major scientists and specialists in the most diverse branches of knowledge, which enables the group to have its own principled position on many key questions of the work of the extraordinary Congress and in general on the main avenues of the activity of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—like the transition to a market economy in the republic, the resurrection of the Russian countryside, participation in the formation of a Union treaty, and Russia's constitutional structure.

We must pay its due to the leadership of the republic's Supreme Soviet, A. Sokolov noted, which heeds the opinion of the "Communists of Russia," consults with their representatives, and holds meetings where different viewpoints are specified and acceptable positions are elaborated. We are not in favor of confrontation but of consolidation and cooperation, in favor of resurrecting Russia not on our own but together.

Then the representatives of the group answered numerous questions from journalists. Primarily talk turned, of course, on the attitude of the "Communists of Russia" toward the Congress decisions which determine agrarian policy in the republic.

"We are not against private ownership as such," answered the group's chairman, Professor I. Bratishchev, department chief at the Rostov Institute of Railroad Transport Engineers. "We oppose private ownership of the land and its buying and selling. The land is not a product of human labor. Especially as it has so happened historically in Russia that it has always been community property. That is why it must be returned to common use."

"In addition, existing forms of ownership of the land do not rule out but presuppose the opportunity to run an individual peasant farm," noted Candidate of Juridical Sciences lecturer Yu. Slobodkin, chairman of the Solnechnogorsk City People's Court.

The participants in the meeting also reported on the work done by the "Communists of Russia" group to create an alternative draft RSFSR Constitution and basic principles for its formation. The draft RSFSR Constitution submitted for discussion in their opinion contains many undemocratic elements, which could lead in the very near future to deadlock situations in the leadership of the republic.

Exhaustive replies to journalists' questions were also given by other participants in the conference—V. Demina, chairman of the "Zavety Ilicha" collective farm, Bryansk Oblast, and V. Tarasov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Volga-Urals military district.

PRAVDA Report

PM1012125790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[O. Kuzmina report: "Communists' Stance"]

[Text] Representatives of the "Communists of Russia" deputies' group and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputies held a news conference at the CPSU Central Committee Press Center yesterday which was attended by Soviet and foreign journalists.

There were a lot of people in the hall—everyone was interested in the subject of the discussion which was announced in advance: Progress at the Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, the RSFSR Constitution, and the land question. This was the topic on which the conversation centered. It became clear at the press conference that Russia's Communists are by no means opposed to private ownership altogether, but categorically oppose private ownership of land. "Another 'elemental land seizure and partition' [chernyy peredel]," one of those present said," may produce bloody shoots." V. Demina, chairman of Bryansk Oblast's "Zavety Ilicha" Kolkhoz [collective farm], told the gathering that the collective is applying all its efforts to help people organize personal plots, and they would not oppose people's leaving the kolkhoz if they so desire; the only point is that there is no one who wants to do this. Deputies also spoke of their analysis of cables received by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. It showed that 90 percent of their senders oppose the introduction of private ownership and the buying and selling of land.

Speaking about the draft RSFSR constitution proposed by the working group, the speakers noted that it contains a number of undemocratic provisions.

The "Communists of Russia" expressed their stance on issues of interest to journalists and rejected, in particular, a journalist's suggestion that the faction is operating at the bidding of the central apparatus.

A. Sokolov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee; I. Bratishchev, group chairman and department head at the Rostov Institute of Railroad Engineers; and Yu. Slobodkin, chairman of Solnechnogorsk Municipal People's Court, also took part in the press conference's work.

Russian Republican Party Congress Detailed

LD1911130190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0510 GMT 19 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich on the founding congress of the Republican Party of Russia (RPR), held in Moscow on 17 and 18 November, including interview with Vyacheslav Nikolayevich Shostakovskiy, member of the RPR organizing committee on 18 November; place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Shakhnovich] This constituent congress lasted two days and the result is that the Democratic Platform, which was already outside the CPSU, has become the Republican Party of Russia. So we now have Republicans.

I would say this must be one of the calmist congresses that I have attended. There were no serious disagreements between the delegates. The party has taken a left-of-center, social democratic stance, and among the country's political forces it is at least one of the top three parties, alongside the Democratic Party of Russia and the Social Democratic Party. Incidentally, Oleg Rumyantsev, one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party, spoke on its behalf at the congress.

Moreover, it is possible that there could at some time be a unification congress, at which these two parties would unite. Its attitude to its former kinsman—the Communist Party—is more loyal than some of the other democratic parties. The party does not regard itself as anticommunist, though nor, of course, is it pro-communist.

Its main aims include support for the basic principles of the Russian government's economic program; suspension of the powers of the USSR people's deputies; and the replacement of the Union Government with an interregional coalition, whose members would be sent as delegates by the republics. Furthermore, there is talk of using solely political means to resolve conficts, and of course the depoliticization of the armed forces, the KGB, and the Interior Ministry.

Its declaration also says this party advocates the establishment of genuine sovereignty for Russia, and the attainement of civic and interethinc accord in the republic. The party will be part of the Democratic Russia bloc, and will thus join a coalition with other democratic movements. The party considers itself to be in opposition to the CPSU.

Here is Vyacheslav Nikolayevich Shostakovskiy, a member of the organizing committee.

Vyacheslav Nikolayevich, how would you describe this, the final day of the constituent congress?

[Shostakovskiy] There have been some gains and some losses. We have gained a party. There are lots of parties at the moment, and so I should say what sort of party is it, and how it is organized—that is a gain, too. The process of forming the party comes from the grassroots, and that is of fundamental importance. There are none of those closet intrigues. It is a genuinely democratic party. The party revolves around the individual, defense of his rights, and humanism.

There have been some losses, too. I do not think the name we have given the party is a terribly happy one—Republican.

[Shakhnovich] Overtones of the United States, and the Republicans there...

[Shostakovskiy, interrupting] Actually, it's not that there are overtones of the United States. The classic experience—of which our people have little inkling, although given time they will learn—is that as a general rule republican parties are very right-wing on the classic political spectrum. They have a unitarian structure. But this is a specific feature, and we will probably have to explain this quite often. That is the way things have turned out. By and large, I hope and trust that we are now rolling.

[Shakhnovich] What are the main tasks? How do you see the party's immediate objectives?

[Shostakovskiy] To defend the sovereignty of the Russian Federation and make it real, because support for its sovereignty is a constant task that must be constantly pursued. This is particularly true since there can only be full-fledged, genuine sovereignty once there is a democratic society, and we still have a long way to go to reach that sort of society.

We must still create mature democratic institutions, and the institutions of a civic society in the forms of various associations—not just political parties, but associations that would allow the individual to select freely and independently the sort of economic, political, and spiritual existence he wishes to have. We have none of this at the moment. Here in this country we have turned the working man into state property: We belong to the state from the cradle to the grave.

This mentality can only be broken down by hard work, and it will take a long time to establish, to erect, mature democratic institutions.

Leader Summarizes Position

LD1811225190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Nov 90

[Text] The constituent congress of the Republican Party of Russia is ending its work in Moscow now. Our correspondent, (Kirill Shakhnovich) reports:

[Begin recording] [(Shakhnovich)] My conversation partner is one of the leaders of the Democratic Platform outside the CPSU, Vladimir Nikolayevich Lysenko. I can now congratulate you on the formation of the new Russian Republican Party. How might you described the goals and tasks of this party?

[Lysenko] The new party will have a left-of-center stance. We do not want to create a kind of deideologized party, but a party of common sense, a party of political realism which would be able to fight for specific goals and tasks which any ordinary person can understand. In other words, we want the creation of an effective market economy, the social protection of every citizen in the republic, the achievement of interethnic accord between the various peoples of the republic and of the country, and guarantee of the rights of the individual, independent of his social position.

I think it is just such a party that does not aggravate confrontation today, but which is really ready to cooperate constructively, that is necessary in the political spectrum of our republic.

[(Shakhnovich)] What is your attitude toward your native Communist Party? Here at the congress, the idea was heard that you are not anticommunist, yet you are not a communist. Nevertheless, in the spectrum of political forces, your party engages in more moderate opposition to the communists.

[Lysenko] We state clearly that we are in opposition to the CPSU and in opposition to the Russian Communisty Party. We have many people who are hostile toward the CPSU. My position is that any political party should have the right to exist. Generally speaking, we maintain relations with individual members of the CPSU. I think that this is normal. I think that this party will continue to enter into the process and break it up into more democratic pieces. All the time it will decline drastically.

[(Shakhnovich)] Let us sum up these two days of the congress's work.

[Lysenko] I think the the main result of the congress is not that a constructive program and the rules of the party have been adopted, but that union policy decisions were adopted that make it possible in the current critical situation to be at the center of existing political activity and exert an active influence on existing events. First and foremost, we support the radical steps of the Russian Government and the Russian legislature. It is support for the speeches in the Supreme Soviet by Yeltsin, and support for representatives of the Baltic and Armenia regarding it being necessary not to create a new union from above, but that it is necessary for the republics to conclude economic agreements and to set up a coordinating council with full powers which will determine the further development both of the economy and of other spheres of public life.

What is needed today is to hold a roundtable of the political parties of our republic in order to remove that lack of trust and actual confrontation which is currently moving toward mutual destruction. I think that in such a situation it is impossible to work further. This can lead to a social explosion and lots of other things. [end recording]

Shostakovskiy on New Party

91UN0412A Moscow SOYUZ in Russian No 47, Nov 90 p 5

[Report on interview with V. Shostakovskiy, co-chairman of the Coordinating Council of the Republican Party of Russia, by Nikolay Kasyanov, under the rubric "New Parties"; place and date not given: "Republicans Are Entering the Political Arena"]

[Text] [Kasyanov] Vyacheslav Nikolayevich, it was not all that long ago that you, then Rector of the Moscow Higher Party School, and your colleagues from the Democratic Platform in the CPSU announced that you had decided to quit the party. And now the new, Republican Party of Russia was created. What is the program of the party, its goals, tasks, and ideology?

[Shostakovskiy] Yes, it is true that after the 28th CPSU Congress everybody understood: That party could not be changed or reformed from within. Many people finally saw that the communist ideology, with its rigid party framework, had no future and, further, that it was detrimental to the development of our country.

But it is still my conviction that new parties could form basically from the forces and from the people whose intellectual potential and organizing talents were previously monopolized by the one-party structure. The specific feature of our party as an independent one is, first, that many of our comrades-in-arms came to us from the CPSU. Second, in spite of their understandable disappointment in the party's communist ideology, we cannot build our work entirely on the "mirror" principle—"everything is bad in the CPSU, everything is good in our party"; neither can we make do with an abstractly applied anti-communism.

In essence, we are a party of social initiatives. As we build our structures in the most free manner, as we give top priority to the development of independent regional associations, we are trying to employ political means to develop self-administration. We should not aim at global targets but use all our power to try to establish a civil society in our country. We described all of this, with full responsibility, at the initiative congress of our party which took place several days ago in Moscow.

[Kasyanov] Judging from your program guidelines, the Republicans are more a movement than a party and they lean towards social democratic concepts. Is this right?

[Shostakovskiy] I would say that we are really a movement which is being crystallized into a party. We would like to borrow all the best features from these two forms of social organization. As for the social democratic concepts... Speaking of them you have to keep in mind that many of the participants in our party club movement, from the days when the Democratic Platform was still being formed, shared the values of our contemporary social democracy. We, the Republican Party of Russia, have agreed with the Social Democratic Party on a number of issues, we also share some of their program guidelines, including the need for the social protection of the people in general.

Just like them, and just as decisively, we speak for the realistic sovereignty of the Russian Federation, but there are some things that divide us. We have a much tougher stand in favor of the market economy and diverse forms of property. In the sphere of social protection, which is the main one for Social Democrats, we are oriented, very realistically I believe, by the qualified strata of the population, and by a realistic market policy. We proceed from the concept that a market without diverse forms of property is either a truncated market or, rather, a Rizhskiy market [farmers' market in Moscow]. That is why we have established, even before our congress, the "Business People's Club" and now we are using political methods to encourage, particularly through our still small factions in the soviets, the creation of a network of economic clubs, innovative foundations, and self-administration structures. They should serve as a political-economic unit to help our society advance towards becoming socially and economically civilized.

[Kasyanov] What is the structure of your party? Who is financing it? What social groups or strata does it represent?

[Shostakovskiy] Its structure is simple. Local clubs and primary organizations elect territorial and regional organs. The latter have priority over the determination of local policies. We do not have organizations at working places even though they may exist in workers' collectives and function during non-work hours. Our congress is the highest body, the Coordinating Council is its executive organ. We have a minimum staff, especially because our system of financing would prevent us from having too many officials. Actually, the Coordinating Council will use only the R3 [rubles] that party members pay as an annual registration fee. Other fees, which should not exceed one percent of one's income, will be given for the needs of regional organizations and associations and the size of the fee will be determined by the regional organizations themselves. We may be able to get some money from our publications and from our newspaper sales—all this money will be used for charity, which is an important part of our program, and for the creation of a civil rights protection structure meant to help our people achieve the rule-of-law state other than on the pages of newspapers and magazines.

We have a rather good sociological service. It helped to determine, by the way, that the majority of our supporters can be found within the scientific and technical and other groups of intelligentsia. But that does not mean much. They are almost as plentiful in the CPSU, there are enough engineers among the Constitutional Democrats also. I would like to believe that we represent the interests of all people endowed with common sense.

[Kasyanov] Are you not afraid to start your work under the conditions of the party ideology crisis and the general deterioration of trust in all parties?

[Shostakovskiy] The anti-party feelings are really widely spread now and that can be said about other countries also. Many people think that all of this is nothing but demagoguery, empty talk, or petty intrigue. But, you know, not a single country can harmonize the interests of its very different social groups without involving parties. At present, in our country these interests are still very similar, but with time the difference among them is going to intensify. Here is another simple example: No party that elected its deputies from the party lists would allow them to behave the way some of our people's representatives behave in the soviets. Yes, the party provides the support but it is also concerned with its image...

[Kasyanov] What would you wish for your party today?

[Shostakovskiy] "To squeeze Bolshevism out drop by drop." I would not want to see a revival of the authoritarian character, of intolerance, or of its monopoly on truth. I would wish it to have more critical realism. I would not want to see a restoration, under the new conditions, of the false ideological phantoms, or new myths, or blinders. Here is the main thing for us to remember, we who call ourselves republicans: You cannot give promises to give food and clothes to the people; you have to do everything possible to enable the people to find their food and clothes themselves.

Russian Democratic Party Publishes Newspaper

LD1111112990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] The first edition of DEMOKRATICHESKAYA GAZETA was issued today. It is the organ of the Russian Democratic Party.

In a conversation with our correspondent Yuliy Yanovskiy, the new paper's chief editor stated that the paper will come out twice a month and will probably become a daily later. It will regularly cover news of party life in the regional organizations of the Russian Democratic Party as well as matters connected with the present situation in the country, international life, and culture.

Russian Foreign Trade Bank To Open Jan 1991

91UF0212A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2

[Article by M. Berger: "Russian Foreign Trade Bank Begins Operations"]

[Text] **We have received an official notice that the Foreign Trade Bank of Russia has been created and exists at this address: Moscow, Kuznetskiy Most, 16. The bank plans to begin direct operations in January 1991.**

Not so officially, it has been reported to us that the collective of the Moscow Zhilsotsbank [Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development] and its premises have merged with the Foreign Trade Bank (the latter is especially important since the competition for its premises was almost as strong among banks as the struggle for spheres of influence).

The Foreign Trade Bank will conduct both hard currency and ruble operations, and the bank's joint stock capital, according to information from the weekly KOMMERSANT, will be 1.4 billion "simple" and 600 million hard-currency rubles.

The establishment of the Foreign Trade Bank can be regarded as an encroachment on the monopoly of the USSR Vneshekonombank [Bank for Foreign Economic Activity], which, incidentally, the workers of the Union foreign trade bank themselves have a positive feeling about, understanding that it is impossible to create a market without a ramified banking system. But one must assume that the matter will not be restricted to pure competition. The republic Foreign Trade Bank, as far as one can judge from what is known about its founding documents, will also perform political functions by providing for the independence of Russia's foreign economic policy. How successful it is will depend on how they coordinate the function, stated in the charter of the Foreign Trade Bank, of controlling the gold supply and the currency reserves with the provision from the draft Union treaty, according to which it is the USSR that is to keep and use the gold and diamond supply, coordinating these activities with the republics.

But the main problem that will have to be resolved by the Foreign Economic Bank, in the opinion of the bankers, is not even how to divide up the gold and currency, if they do this at all; although this problem is an extremely difficult one. In addition to everything else, after it is divided up it might turn out that the amount of debts is greater than the amount of currency. But what is incomparably more difficult to resolve is the problem of skilled personnel for the Foreign Trade Bank.

In the first place, there are very few really qualified bankers. According to people in the know, there may be dozens of them but no more. And it is not feasible to train the necessary number in a short period of time. In the second place, those bank workers whom their Western colleagues can call bankers without stretching the point are constantly being eyed by commercial banks, joint enterprises, and even Western credit institutions. They can take away capable people simply by offering them conditions which would be impossible for workers of our state and semi-state banks even in their wildest dreams. The USSR Foreign Trade Bank, where previously it was extremely difficult to get a job, today is sustaining very significant personnel losses, which bothers officials of this institution no less than the problems of defaulting on hard currency payments.

Can the Foreign Trade Bank be sufficiently competitive in the struggle with commercial banks, joint enterprises, or even Western firms for high-class specialists. This problem, incidentally, is crucial not only for the Russian bank but also for all other structures that are important to state economic interests, but are restricted by this same state in their financial capabilities in the area of wages. The labor market, with which they are now so eager to frighten people, not only involves the struggle for a job but also a no less serious struggle for well trained specialists. And only those employers who recognize this simple but, for us, fairly new reality can count on success.

Ivashko Addresses Party Secretaries in Obninsk

PM0512123690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by TASS correspondent Yu. Solyanikov: "Reliable Party Support"]

[Text] Obninsk (Kaluga Oblast), 1 Dec—A wide spectrum of problems worrying Communists was examined at a regional conference of secretaries from the oblast's primary party organizations, which was held here.

V.A. Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, addressed the leaders of the party organizations.

Such conferences were initiated by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. It is imperative to get to grips with the burning issues confronting the party on the road to renewal. The Secretariat, he stressed, regards these conferences as a way of giving practical help to primary party organization secretaries in their endeavor to carry out the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress.

The CPSU Central Committee deputy general secretary analyzed the current political situation in the country, the state of the party, and its place in various social structures. He spoke frankly about errors which have occurred in the course of perestroyka.

V.A. Ivashko highlighted two of the many vital tasks facing the primary party organizations today. The first is to employ every means available to support and actively participate in the implementation of the presidential program laid out by M.S. Gorbachev at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. The second, equally important, task is to ensure Communists' participation in the elaboration and implementation of the Union Treaty.

The people's reaction to the presidential program was positive. However, the necessary mechanisms for its efficient realization are missing. Naturally, in this work the Communist president can rely on the members of the party he heads and on the primary organizations that unite them. In today's conditions, this is a tangible force capable of achieving stability in society and preserving a union of equal peoples.

V.A. Ivashko stressed the need to make fuller use of the increased rights, greater opportunities, and independence of primary party organizations. Every Communist, every party organization has to assume a worthy role in implementing the presidential program and the provisions of the Union Treaty, a draft of which has been submitted for nationwide discussion.

The secretaries of primary party organizations who spoke at the conference devoted a lot of attention to the ideological positions occupied by Communists, the need to clarify ideological stances, and the need to establish and strengthen permanent links between the party central headquarters and primary organizations. A discussion of the tactics employed in communist activities and the positive steps taken by primary organizations to improve the economic situation in the localities took place in an atmosphere of openness and trust. The Communists expressed a readiness to support the president of the country and the CPSU Central Committee general secretary in his duties.

Ivashko Meets With Kaluga Communists

LD0112215290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Dec 90

[Report by correspondent M. Zotov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] There was a meeting in Obninsk today between the communists of Kaluga oblast and Vladimir Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

[Zotov] Those attending were mainly secretaries of grassroots party organizations, heads of enterprises in Obninsk, and of collective and state farms of nearby rayons. They all wanted to know the future of the CPSU, which has recently found itself in a somewhat difficult situation. One of the main questions asked of Vladimir Ivashko at the meeting was: How will the CPSU work in conditions of a market economy?

[Begin recording] [Ivashko] (?A certain) Deputy (Sukhov), comes from the same place as I do, Poltava, says: So, we have to change our name to the Capitalist Party of the Soviet Union. I say: No, I will wait a bit. And the name of the society that we are going to build—do you think we need to change the name of the communist Party? That is the first thing. I think the society we are going to build is a socialist society; this is written in the keynote statement of the 28th Congress. Anyone who saw the speech by Comrade Gorbachev at his recent meeting with cultural figures—he purposely set out that bloc, so to say, in that sense. [sentence as heard]

This was stressed at the October plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. There cannot be any two opinions about this. Is there any need to change the name of the Communist Party? I am categorically against this, as a communist, as one of the members of the party. As long as my strength remains I shall strike and struggle against this. [passage omitted]

[Zotov] The party still considers itself the vanguard of perestroyka, or rather the vanguard of society. And some communists are saying that in practice the party has been in opposition for the last two years. Perhaps we shouldn't speak of it being the vanguard of society?

[Ivashko] The point is that the party, in following its policy—social and economic policy and any other—should make it attractive to people. The party that does not have an attractive policy is of no use to anyone. That is the essence of the matter. And as to whether it will be the vanguard or not, people themselves will confirm, so to say, by their votes. [end recording]

Journalists Congress Discusses Union Rules, Aims

PM2711115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by S. Oganyan and V. Sinenko: "What Kind of Creative Union?"]

[Text] The second stage of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Journalists constituent congress opened yesterday in the TASS conference hall. The agenda includes discussion of the draft Agreement on the Association of Russian Journalists on a Federative Basis, the adoption of the future organization's rules, the formation of leading organs, and the drafting of principles and rules for a trade union for workers in the press and mass media.

USSR People's Deputy V. Kucher, chairman of the provisional executive committee of the RSFSR Union of Journalists and recently confirmed editor of the Council of Ministers' weekly ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI, delivered a report entitled "Providing Russia with a Free, Independent Creative Journalists' Organization." He stated that the future organization must enhance the social role of journalists, protect press workers, and create a legal basis for their work with the right to conduct financial and economic activity.

Discussion of the report was heated and keen, with differing assessments. The delegates were addressed by I. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The congress continues.

Congress Ends; Leader Elected

PM2811125790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by V. Sinenko under the "Round and About" rubric: "Journalists, Unite!"]

[Text] The constituent congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Union of Journalists ended yesterday. Delegates from autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts signed a treaty on forming a RSFSR Union of Journalists on a federal basis. The fundamental nature of the discussion is shown by the fact that delegates rejected the initial draft treaty submitted by the temporary executive committee. In the congress participants' view, the final version was more democratic. Provisions are made for the possibility of ratification of the treaty at the local level. The draft statutes of the RSFSR Union of Journalists also underwent great changes in the course of the discussion.

The Russian journalists acted as the initiators of the creation of a press and mass media workers' trade union. The draft statutes and concept for the future trade union will be discussed in the republic's journalists' organizations.

The RSFSR Union of Journalists' leadership bodies were formed. In a secret ballot, Professor V.I. Novikov, who is director of the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA Publishing House, was elected chairman of the new union from among four candidates.

Russian Afghan War Veterans Set Up Union

PM2311145590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Congress of Veterans of the Afghan War Finishes Work"]

[Text] The constituent congress of the Russian Union of Afghanistan Veterans, on which our newspaper has already carried a report, ended on 21 November. Delegates discussed and outlined the main directions and concept of the new organization's activity, adopted the Russian Union of Afghanistan Veterans Program and Statute, and formed a board of administration.

The first section of the program states that "the main objectives of the Russian Union of Afghanistan Veterans are to protect the civil, political, economic, and social rights and freedoms of veterans; assist the treatment and physical recuperation of veterans who have lost the ability to work as a result of injury or other damage to their health; immortalize the names and feats of those who died; educate young people in the best traditions of the Russian people and other peoples in Russia; and broaden and strengthen international ties with veteran organizations in other countries in order to strengthen peace and friendship between nations."

The congress received greetings messages from President M.S. Gorbachev; B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet; and Afghan President Najibullah.

With a minute of silence the congress honored the memory of the internationalist servicemen who died in Afghanistan.

Addressing delegates on behalf of the USSR Defense Ministry, Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, expressed sincere sympathy for the mothers and all other relatives of those servicemen who died on Afghan soil or went missing in action and assured his audience that the USSR Defense Ministry will give all the help it possibly can in the practical activity of the Russian Union of Afghanistan Veterans.

Yu.V. Skokov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, read out the RSFSR Council of Ministers resolution "On the Work of the Russian Union of Afghanistan Veterans," which, in particular, enshrines the legal basis of this work and defines preferential conditions for economic activity by organizations and enterprises belonging to the veterans' union throughout Russia.

Confederation of Deported Nations Formed

LD2411215190 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 24 Nov 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandras Budris and Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The creation of the Confederation of Nations—Victims of Repression was announced in Moscow today at a constituent congress of this new public and political organisation. Representatives of Balkars, Ingushs, Kalmyks, Karachais, Crimean Tartars, Soviet Germans and Chechens, that were forcibly evicted from their traditional areas of settlement during the Stalin rule and scattered all over the country, voiced their intention to work for the restoration of the territorial-legal status of the nations, that some time ago fell victim to repressions.

During the two days of the congress its participants adopted the rules of the Confederation, a declaration and a number of appeals to the leaders of the USSR and Russia and to international organisation.

Ismail Aliyev, 44, who was elected president of the Presidium of the Confederation, told journalists that its most important task would be to pool the efforts of nations and to channel them to the restoration of rights, trumpled under the Stalin rule, to their territorial, political, economic and cultural rehabilitation. The Confederation will work for attaining its goals "only by parliamentary methods, using the experience of people's diplomacy." Aliyev stressed that the Confederation does not intend to resort to actions or declarations undermining the interests of other nations of the country. He does not rule out a possibility of the expansion of the Confederation through its joining by associations of other deported nations of the USSR, "if their activities do not run counter to the rules of the organisation."

The headquarters of the Confederation of Nations—Victims of Repressions will be located in the city of Karachayevsk, Northern Caucasus.

Polish-Russian Friendship Declaration

AU1611093390 Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 13 Nov 90 p 6

["Declaration of Friendship and Good-Neighborly Cooperation Between the Republic of Poland and RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic)" signed by Polish Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski and RSFSR Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev in Moscow on 16 October]

[Text] The Republic of Poland and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic], guided by the provisions of the UN Charter and CSCE Final Act and subsequent CSCE documents; taking into account the importance of Polish-Russian relations for cooperation in this region and in the continent as a whole, with a feeling of responsibility for peace, security, accord, and cooperation in a democratic, peaceful, and human rights- respecting Europe; desiring to preserve the positive values of the centuries of Polish-Russian relations so far; and aiming to create the basis of friendly, good-neighborly co-existence and the development of close relations between themselves, as well as the basis for a lasting accord and reconciliation between the peoples of Russia and Poland, hereby declare the following:

1. Mutual relations between the Republic of Poland and RSFSR are to be based on an observance of international law, especially on a respect of their sovereignty and territorial integrity, equality, non-interference in internal affairs, good neighborliness, and mutually advantageous cooperation.

2. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR have no territorial claims against each other and will not make any such claims in future.

The existing demarcated border between the Republic of Poland and RSFSR, as defined in the 16 August 1945 agreement between the Republic of Poland and USSR on the Polish-Soviet state border and in the 5 March 1957 agreement between the Republic of Poland and USSR on the state border in the waters of the Baltic Sea, is inviolable now and in future. The border between the Republic of Poland and RSFSR is an important component of the peaceful settlement in Europe.

3. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will aim to revitalize and enhance cooperation in the economic sphere. In particular, they will create favorable conditions for modern trade exchange and scientific-technical cooperation based on the principle of mutual advantages.

Most of all, the Republic of Poland and RSFSR will encourage direct cooperation between enterprises, as well as a comprehensive development of cooperation between the north-eastern voivodships of Poland and the Kaliningrad Oblast in the RSFSR.

Both states will prepare the legal basis for an expansion of economic cooperation.

4. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will, on the basis of international law, act closely together to protect the environment and rationally exploit natural resources in order to ensure mutual ecological safety and prevent, reduce, and eliminate cross-border pollution between the two states. For this purpose, the governments of both states will also exchange mutual information and hold periodic consultations.

5. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will expand broadly- understood cooperation in the spheres of culture and humanitarian problems, and will also undertake action to simplify administrative procedures and interpersonal contacts, including private trips by individuals, which is of particular importance for mutual acquaintanceship and understanding between the peoples of both states.

In order to acquaint themselves with each other's cultural and scientific achievements, the Republic of Poland and RSFSR will open information and culture centers in Leningrad and Warsaw respectively.

6. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will aim toward a broad and genuine socialization of mutual contacts. For this purpose they will create the necessary conditions to expand direct contacts between the societies of both states, especially young people, political parties, religious denominations, social organizations, artistic and professional associations, trade unions, and others.

On account of the special role of the young generation in shaping mutual relations and accord and in consolidating friendship and mutual understanding between the peoples of both states, the governments of the Republic of Poland and RSFSR will conclude an agreement on youth cooperation and youth exchanges.

Poles living in the RSFSR and representatives of RSFSR minorities in Poland should play a particular role in mutual acquaintanceship, rapprochement, and understanding. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will foster a mutual development of the national identities of these peoples and render comprehensive assistance in their work; in nurturing and continuing their language and traditions; and in satisfying their cultural, educational, and religious needs.

The Republic of Poland will protect monuments to Russian history and culture in Poland. The RSFSR will protect monuments to Polish history and culture in Russia.

7. The Republic of Poland and RSFSR will establish diplomatic and consular relations and hold consultations on every issue concerning their bilateral relations. Likewise they will collaborate in the international arena and consult each other on international issues of concern to both sides.

RSFSR Textile Industry Strike Threat Viewed

914F0055A Moscow TRUD in Russian 21 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by A. Bogomolov: "Strikes Can Be Avoided"]

[Text] The Kamyshlov sewing factory, where about 1,200 people work, is standing idle for the second week in a row. The Orel knitting factory could shut down in a couple of days, and after it—the Chaykovskiy combine and the Moscow rug association. The same thing threatens 24 other enterprises of the light and textile industry of Russia. The reason is the shortage of raw materials and the lack of batching items for the equipment. There is rapid destabilization of republic economic ties, which today are collapsing like a house of cards. As a result, agreements for raw material supply in 1991 have been concluded by only 20-60 percent. The government says that there is no hard currency for buying the basic materials abroad.

Strike and job action committees are being created in the majority of enterprises. The Russian regional committee of the branch trade union has formed a coordination committee for protecting the socioeconomic interests of the labor collectives. In the opinion of its leader, T. Sosnina, the trade union has not yet been able to take control of the situation. But it cannot be ruled out that a wildcat strike may break out. Taking this into account, the branch trade union staff supports the decision of the labor collectives to conduct a general organized warning strike if their demands are not met by 15 December.

In addition to the demands to allot the enterprises 1.5 billion hard currency rubles for raw materials, the trade union is raising the question of increasing wages and also the possibility of selling 50 percent of its products at free prices. The last condition was brought about by the considerably increased cost of agricultural raw material. If the retail prices of finished goods do not change, then, according to predictions of experts of the trade union regional committee, in 1991 every second enterprise of the light and textile industry will be operating at a loss.

The figures are frightening. The statistics of the empty store shelves inspire a profound sense of futility. In satisfying the trade union ultimatum, the government, from all appearances, will have to turn on another inflationary "faucet" and we shall continue our journey in the paper sea of useless rubles. At the same time, a failure to meet the demands will lead the branch to a final collapse. In a word, we will have neither a coat nor shoes if the government does not find some hard currency in its tattered state pocket.

The Russian trade union center has come to the defense of the trade union of textile workers and made an insistent request to the republic government to form coordination commission. There was a preliminary meeting between the chairman of the FNPR [Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia], I. Klochkov, and the deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, Yu. Skokov. The two leaders agreed that the collapse of the light and textile industry would lead to a total emptying out of the consumer market, which in and of itself could cause a return of mass uprisings and strikes, and of more than just one branch. Everything will depend on the readiness of the sides to proceed toward compromise and on their patience with one another at the negotiating table. And still the scale of the conflict forces us to assume that its regulation will not be painless. As was reported from the RSFSR Council of Ministers, the coordination commission has begun its work.

Russian Textile Workers Union Demands Action

LD0712131190 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 7 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—The Russian Textile and Light Industry Workers' Union has urged the leadership of the country and the Russian Federation to act to meet workers' demands before December 15.

The demands are connected with overcoming the crisis in the sector and ensuring the social protection of workers during the transition to market relations.

Otherwise, the trade union's coordinating council, following the will of work collectives, intends to call a two-hour warning strike on December 17, 1990—the day of the opening of the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies—reserving the right to subsequent collective actions.

"We are by no means advocating pressure methods: we have been compelled to resort to them by truly emergency circumstances," Tatyana Sosnina, member of the Trade Union's Coordinating Council and the chairperson of the Russian Committee of the Textile and Light Industry Workers' Union, told TASS.

A three to seven fold increase in state purchasing prices of agricultural raw materials for the textile and light industry and the introduction of still higher contractual prices by republics would inevitably lead to a respective increase in retail prices of fabrics, clothes and footwear and to a sharp curtailment of the manufacture of prime necessities, Sosnina emphasised.

Practice has shown that the conciliation commission of the sectoral trade union of textile workers and the government of russia is unable to take light industry out of the crisis.

Under these conditions, work collectives demand that the Federal and Russian Governments take coordinated decisions immediately: to provide the sector with raw and other materials within the framework of intra-union and republican deliveries not below this year's level, to assign the necessary currency funds for purchases abroad, to reconsider price formation policy and to determine measures of economic protection during the enterprises' and the population's transition to market relations.

"Only an urgent solution to these and other pressing problems would take the strain off the explosive situation in the sector," Sosnina maintains.

New Journal Published in Russia

LD1411133790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 14 Nov 90

[Text] RUSSKOYE BOGATSTVO [RUSSIAN WEALTH], a new magazine, has appeared in the country. The registration certificate names the following objective: The creation of a magazine by one author, in which each issue is done independently by a new person from the first to last page. RUSSKOYE BOGATSTVO is a private, independent magazine that belongs to Anatoliy Zlobin.

Leonid Likhozeyev has fearlessly taken on the first issue. Fortunately it turns out he has a satirical novel in reserve that has been in his desk for approximately 20 years. Behind him a line has already formed. And what a line it is: Bulat Okudzhava, Mikhail Rushchin, Vladimir Kornilov.

I have said that the magazine is a new one, but if one is to be precise, then RUSSKOYE BOGATSTVO had been published in Russia for more than four decades. Among its authors were Bunin, Andreyev, Kuprin, and Korolenko. However, in 1918 the publication was closed down. But, fortunately, as you see, not forever.

Deputies Confer on Russia-Estonia Treaty

PM1411101390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by V. Lisin, member of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet: "What Form Should the Treaty Between Russia and Estonia Take?"]

[Text] Ivan-gorod, Leningrad Oblast—"No new Karabakh on Estonian soil"—that was the main theme of the work of the joint session of people's elected representatives of six border cities. Three are Estonian cities with a predominantly Russian-speaking population (Narva, Sillamae, and Kohtla-Jarve) and three are in Leningrad Oblast (Ivan-gorod, Kingisepp, and Slantsy) and they have close economic, cultural, social, and family ties.

Over 300 people's deputies held a fervent and thorough discussion of what form the treaty between Russia and Estonia should take and whether the interests of Russian speakers, who constitute more than 40 percent of Estonia's population, will be fully taken into account. They expressed their will in a declaration adopted by an absolute majority of votes. The declaration says among other things that Estonia's state status should be defined in such a way that it takes into account the existing economic ties and the demographic situation and guarantees equal rights for all inhabitants of the republic and that it is necessary to define measures to protect the civic rights of the indigenous population and also military servicemen and members of their families in the event of a unilateral violation of the treaty. But the most important thing, the session noted, is that such important decisions must not be made behind people's backs. People's deputies insist on taking part in elaborating the treaty.

"In expressing our opinion on the political treaty," the declaration notes, "we consider that an economic treaty can and must be signed so as to preserve the single economic space."

Moscow Food Crisis Blamed on Mismanagement

PM1412090790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[A. Butsenin report under "A Topic Continued" rubric: "Emergency Milk"]

[Text] A SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA article of 6 December of this year entitled "Emergency Milk," in which the authors repudiate the Moscow City Soviet leadership's references to a food blockade of the capital allegedly taking place in connection with the ongoing crisis situation in the provision of Muscovites with food products, has been described as untrue and scandalous by Moscow Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee] Chairman Yu.M. Luzhkov at a session of the Moscow City Soviet.

No one has a monopoly on indignation. But today citizens have far more grounds for indignation, being fed as they are, in lieu of normal supplies, with discussions about a deliberate, undeclared food blockade of Moscow by apparatus forces and the local organs in the regions.

It is difficult to say what kind of diet of information the city authorities are living on, but, in any case, according to the statistics of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of Trade, the Moscow City Trade Transport Administration, and the Moscow Railroad, the causes of the current food situation can be diagnosed without any special difficulty.

Here are just a few figures. The situation as of 7 December was that more than 700 railcars carrying meat, milk products, sugar, and other food commodities had accumulated in the railroad sidings of Moscow's freight stations, waiting to be unloaded. If only these goods could be gotten onto the shelves of empty stores!

It even turns out that more than expected has been being delivered to Moscow. Thus in the period January-October, 1,156 million tonnes of meat products were sold in the city. This is 22,000 tonnes more than envisaged. On a per capita basis, 128 kilograms of meat and meat products were sold to inhabitants of the city over the 10-month period, whereas in the country as a whole only 35 kilograms per person were sold via the state and cooperative trade and public catering system from market stocks of meat output. The situation is similar as regards many other types of food.

In his televised address on the "Vremya" program yesterday Yu.M. Luzhkov spoke about serious shortfalls in deliveries. But look at the situation in reality.

In the October-November period alone more than 3,000 tonnes of sugar, 4,500 tonnes of animal fat, and 1,100 tonnes of vegetable oil were delivered above what was envisaged. Yes, there were even 8.8 million rubles worth of those much talked-about tobacco products more than envisaged.

The possibilities of Moscow food industry enterprises themselves for improving the supply of food to citizens are far from limited.

Other data can also be cited testifying to the fact that the issue today should be not combating a food "blockade" of Moscow, but introducing order in distribution relations and establishing tight controls over food products' journey from freightcar to store shelf, and the absence of necessary aid for the collectives of enterprises working below their abilities.

Yes, Moscow is blockaded, but blockaded by its own mismanagement. And it does not become the city Soviet to lay the responsibility on its neighbors' shoulders, and with such meaningful innuendos at that.

Polozkov Meets With Moscow Rayon Aktiv

PM1412093990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting Held"]

[Text] I.K. Polozkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, had a meeting 7 December with the party and soviet aktiv of Sevastopolskiy Rayon in Moscow.

I.K. Polozkov spoke about Russian Communists' work to stabilize the political and economic situation and answered numerous questions.

Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum Held 5 Dec

PM0612140990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum"]

[Text] An organizational plenum of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [city committee] was held on 5 December. The participants discussed and approved the structures of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom and its apparatus. It was decided to form a gorkom commission for questions of organizational-party work, an ideological commission, a commission for socioeconomic problems and collaboration with the workers movement, and a commission for collaboration with state and socioeconomic structures and youth and women's movements. The commissions' work will be backed up by an apparatus of full-time workers.

The plenum elected Moscow CPSU Gorkom secretaries and bureau members by secret ballot on an alternative basis. The chief editor of the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA was also elected.

Moscow Gorkom Party Conference Resumes 29 Nov

Prokofyev Speaks

PM0312131590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[TASS report by B. Grishchenko and B. Shestakov: "At the 28th Moscow City Party Conference: Restoring the People's Trust"]

[Text] After an interruption of many months, the CPSU organization in the capital city resumed its conference 29 November. At the second phase, over 1,000 delegates representing the million-strong army of Moscow party members are discussing the Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee] report on work in the period just past and in the present, as well as the city communists' action program.

Yu. A. Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the party gorkom, noted that the rapid changes in society have literally turned upside down the idea of the party's role and place in the Soviet political system. That is why the gorkom had to change its style, forms, and methods of activity in the period under review—which lasted less than two years—as it went along and move them into the channels of political work.

The speaker asked a harsh and self-critical question about whether Moscow CPSU Gorkom's actions have been equal to the dynamic and complex sociopolitical situation, and whether the qualitative transformations in the city party organization had been sufficiently deep.

It was noted, among other things, that although the decline in the party's prestige is a reflection of objective processes in the country, we must not close our eyes to the fact that the gorkom itself has not been keeping up with events to a certain extent. In a number of cases a superficial analysis of the situation, a lack of foresight, and weak ties with primary party organizations and raykoms [rayon party committees] had a negative effect.

The actual style of the conference's work shows that many of these mistakes have been interpreted and that the necessary conclusions have been drawn from them. The speaker did not need extra time to familiarize the audience with the extensive prepared analytical material. The delegates had received full files of information in advance.

So the most important question was put right away: What is to become of the party and its Moscow organization today and how should the CPSU answer the call of the times? It was stressed that the defeat of the capital's party members in the soviet elections had been a turning point and a signal for rethinking.

The following conclusions must be drawn from this lesson: The processes of democratization must be made deeper, broad social dialogue must be developed, and the mistake resulting from changing Article 6 of the Constitution must be rectified, as communists essentially distanced themselves from resolving socioeconomic problems.

But we must be able not just to admit mistakes but also to put them right. The action for the capital's party organization for the near future, widely discussed by communists ahead of the conference, testifies that this gratifying process is gaining strength.

The most important thing is to turn resolutely to the difficult problems that are worrying not the abstract "masses," but every individual Muscovite and his family. It is from these positions that the document examines methods of establishing the market and denationalizing ownership.

It is directly to the ordinary inhabitant of the city that actions that seem "unimportant" at first sight are directed, such as the organization of the "nanny" service for large families and young parents, and concrete plans for giving assistance to invalids, low-paid people, and veterans. Incidentally, such broad approaches to political work are characteristic of many foreign workers' parties.

The program is based on protecting people's interests. The past complex period in the life of the party and the capital's communists has shown that it is easy to lose the people's trust and difficult to recover it. It is difficult, but it must be done—that is the main task at the moment, and, the speaker stated, the whole life of the city party organization must be subordinated to it.

The invitation made from the rostrum to a joint search for ways to renew the party was the starting point for the discussion that unfolded. Despite the diversity of approaches, the participants were united by the constructive desire to join forces to achieve the intended aims.

M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is participating in the conference.

The emissaries of the capital's communists laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum.

Debate Reported

PM0512164790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by S. Bogatko and Yu. Kazmin under the "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow" rubric: "Restructuring the Ranks"]

[Text] On the eve of the [Moscow City CPSU] conference, whose concluding stage was held 29 and 30 November, delegates received information materials on the state of affairs in the Moscow city CPSU organization. Figures are quite boring things. But try to use your imagination and imagine one million people coming out onto the streets of Moscow simultaneously. Can you see them...? Yet this could happen at a moment's notice, since the organization, linked by the precise discipline of its statutes, numbers almost one million people.

And now, with hand on heart, let us think about something: Which of the latter-day "liberals" would resist the temptation of giving the signal if they had such a powerful force at their disposal? You might say they dream of it... And how is the CPSU behaving? It is carrying on the difficult, tortuous process of interpreting its functions and structures, it is purifying itself of pollution, ridding itself of mistakes and odious figures, listening tolerantly to criticism, which is sometimes unfair, and at times it even has to suffer direct threats. So, who is the real democrat, socialist, and humanist, one wonders...

And something else about figures: Reports about losses from the party ranks have provoked concern among many participants in the conference. It is true that during the period under review the organization's numerical strength has been reduced by almost 100,000, that is, by ten percent. However, in conversations with us some of the conference delegates have noted that statistics say many things, as always, without showing the most important thing. The people who are leaving the party are often people who were never real communists but were just officially in the CPSU ranks in order to be within the most favorable system.

New moods in society were noted at the conference: the growing mistrust of antisocialist forces which managed to disguise their true desires and aims for a certain time by means of outwardly attractive slogans about democracy and freedom. People have started to realize that loud campaigns often hide a desire for the restoration of capitalism—what's more, capitalism in its worst, criminal and speculative form.

It was said quite specifically at the conference that it is primarily the CPSU that is preventing the nouveau riche and the political adventurists from realizing their intentions. That is why they are trying so frenziedly to remove the CPSU from the political arena.

The complications of the transitional period forced the capital's communists to change their tactics sharply. The "program of actions" is not a long-term guideline on general questions but a concrete plan for the near future. It is aimed at providing social protection and civil rights for Muscovites and stabilizing the city's economy.

"We at the Likhachev Automobile Plant have never separated the main questions into purely economic and purely party ones; we always categorized them as political," V. Nosov, an automobile workers' delegate said. "Today, when there is chaos in the country's economy and economic ties are disintegrating, we say right out—these are serious mistakes in our policy."

The communists from the largest enterprise in Moscow have put the question point-blank, so to speak. State enterprises must not be allowed to be transferred into private hands, although a certain proportion of the people's deputies are insisting on just that. The factory is ours and the means of production have been obtained by our own labor, and we do not intend to give them away.

The report made at the conference by Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow party gorkom [city committee] and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, devoted special attention to the communists' work in the soviets. He spoke about how the CPSU gorkom should make fuller use of its experience and prestige in order to give assistance to organs of soviet power without undermining them, relying on communists working in the soviets and their executive committees. The Moscow City Soviet and its executive committee are ultimately required to find out what is going on in the city and how to fill the "black holes." The system of public-state control must be reconstructed on a new democratic basis. This is the direct responsibility of the soviets. As regards the Moscow party organization, it is prepared to involve its thousands of organizations in the common cause.

The idea that it is necessary to concentrate all forces in the party on improving the people's everyday lives stood out in the report. But surely we set ourselves this task when we started perestroyka, Delegate V. Afanasyev asked the audience. The majority of communists believed in the creative search and the possibility for the party leadership to elaborate a strategy and tactics in the face of an economic and political crisis. Unfortunately, hopes have not been justified so far.

The conference expressed support for the labor collectives in their intention to firmly defend their rights in a struggle that does not exclude drastic measures such as strikes and political strikes. The Communist Party has acted—and will continue to act—hand in hand with the workers' movement on the side of just trade union struggle in support of the working people.

The idea that it is time to give up the habit of carrying out party work solely on a global scale was quite justifiably expressed at the conference. Let us recall the well-known saying—it is easier to love mankind than to love specific individuals. Attending to individual needs and giving them priority in its activity—that is what the party organization should concern itself with most.

The controversial subject of the mass media was broached. V. Lysenko, chief editor of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, sharply condemned the CPSU Central Committee administrative department for arbitrarily giving away part of its printing facilities—which is now being used to print newspapers of an anticommunist nature. He called these actions a secret deal that is unjustifiable from a legal and moral viewpoint and contradicts the party Statutes.

In a number of speeches, delegates noted that the report contained real pictures of social ills. The diagnosis of troubles in rayon sections, primary party organizations, and the party gorkom itself was less thorough. These sections were frequently restructured surgically. As a result, many sections have been lost and contacts have become less clear. What has the party lost and what has it acquired in its liberation from administrative and economic functions?

The report did not give a very clear answer to this question, many speakers noted. There are many CPSU members in the Moscow City Soviet. But do the primary party organizatons know about the openly antisocialist speeches made by certain deputies with party membership cards in their pockets? And if they do know, why are they silent, instead of demanding that the deputies carry out the concrete promises they made before the elections concerning the inhabitants' vital needs?

IZVESTIYA on Prokofyev Report

PM0512165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by N. Andreyev: "Moscow City Party Committee Makes Its Position Clear"]

[Text] A meeting of like-minded people is how one could describe the second stage of the 28th Moscow City CPSU organization conference. The organization no longer has its dissenting section of Democratic Platform representatives: They have left the CPSU. And the Marxist Platform, which no longer takes a confrontational attitude and has merged into the CPSU, has yet to appear. It is possible that precisely these factors determined the peaceful start to the conference.

Yu. Prokofyev, first secretary of the city party committee, delivered a report. He touched on virtually every painful aspect of the present sociopolitical situation in the capital. The report was fairly self-critical but was still more critical of others: Mainly the Moscow Soviet.

Communists support hardly any of its initiatives. The first secretary made frequent use of the expressions "the people are rightly critical," "people are bewildered," and "Muscovites rightly say." In the speaker's opinion, the city party committee is given the right to speak on the people's behalf by the following fact: More than 150,000 Muscovites turned out for the 7 November demonstration at its appeal, whereas far fewer people attended the alternate demonstration.

The mass media were strongly criticized. In the speaker's opinion, they "demoralize the public," engage in "historical vandalism," and show immoderate glee at the death of socialism in East Europe. The speaker described all this as ideological shock therapy and did not rule out the possibility that the plans for this originate in the West.

The Moscow City party organization also made its position clear on the draft RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution. The report said that this is nothing other than an attempt to carry out a silent counterrevolutionary coup.

Prokofyev also dwelt on relations between the city party organization and the RSFSR Communist Party. He said that "discussions on this subject have dragged on for too long," "we are all members of the CPSU, and the RSFSR Communist Party is an integral territorial part of the CPSU," and "confrontation is to no one's benefit." Participants in a city party committee plenum were more forthright, however. Speakers demanded that "this unloved child of the party be loved" and that I. Polozkov be defended against attack. It was also noted that one can now speak of a coincidence of views between the republic and city party organizations.

Prokofyev proposed that an extraordinary CPSU congress be held next year at which a new program will be adopted, and that, after this, party members be reregistered and party membership cards exchanged.

Taking part in the debate, Communist V. Nikolayev said that war has now been declared against the party, which is the only body that can prevent any change in the social system. Referring to rumors in the foreign mass media that the Soviet president is going to resign as party leader, he asked M. Gorbachev, sitting in the presidium, why he does not deny or confirm this opinion. The CPSU Central Committee general secretary immediately joined in the dialogue, saying that he has denied this allegation 100 times already. He cited the example of the change of Conservative Party leader in Britain, saying that the party has changed its leader but not relinquished power. So surely we do not have to relinquish power either?

Nikolayev's proposal to hold a citywide Communist subbotnik and use the proceeds to buy food abroad was greeted with uproar. The reason for this uproar is obvious: What could we buy with our "second-rate" ruble?

The conference continues work.

'Special Situation' Imposed on Moscow Trade

PM3011163390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Nov 90 Union Edition p 1

[Article by V. Belikov: "Special Situation Is Introduced in Capital's Trade"]

[Text] The setting of higher prices for a variety of goods and foodstuffs has forced the Moscow authorities to adopt immediate measures for the consumer market. Yu. Luzhkov, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee], talks about this at the request of your IZVESTIYA correspondent.

[Luzhkov] The city's trade is now in a crisis. The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet's decision to refuse to go along with the new prices was not sufficiently thought out from the purely practical, economic standpoint. It would obviously have been worthwhile to explain extensively to all Russians the inevitability of introducing market relations and the resulting price rises, but it should have been clearly stated there and then where and to what ends the extra resources obtained would be going.

This could be direct aid to the socially unprotected strata of the population—elderly people on small pensions, disabled people who are unfit for work, and single mothers. I am certain that such an explanation would be correctly understood by people.

[Belikov] As we know, Moscow was one of the first cities in our coutry to introduce such measures of social protection for the poor.

[Luzhkov] Yes, from this November we have begun to pay out extra money each month to 500,000 people belonging to the small-income categories that I mentioned out of city resources through rayon social protection organs. This will be the pension or allowance received by them plus the top-up from the city up to a general level of 85 rubles [R] per person. This is being financed out of the R40 million flowing into the capital's budget from the commercial sale of cigarettes.

[Belikov] It is not enough to have money in Moscow now, you need to have something to buy with it...

[Luzhkov] The capital remains under a real siege and is not receiving the due amounts of meat, vegetables, sugar, and butter from many oblasts in Russia, the Ukraine, and Latvia.

The Moscow Gorispolkom is continuing to seek with determination to ensure that internal suppliers meet their commitments, operating through Union and republic organs and conducting difficult direct negotiations. In addition to the funds allocated for supplies of imported food we are purchasing essential products with hard currency obtained from the sale of the capital's goods to overseas partners.

We want not just to meet our current needs but also to set up an operational food reserve for the most difficult period—March-May of next year—when the stockpiles of the fall will begin to run down.

[Belikov] Is there hope that such hard-won food will reach Muscovites rather than the black market?

[Luzhkov] We firmly intend to provide such a guarantee ourselves. State-public control over food supply and the movement of food into the stores is being introduced at every level. We are supporting, in particular, the proposal that information about the receipt of goods be prominently displayed in stores each day and the sale of goods checked.

This is one of the measures forming part of the special situation being introduced in the capital for all trade. Other proposals drafted by the Moscow Gorispolkom will be reported to the Moscow City Soviet session to be held in the next few days for confirmation by people's deputies.

Moscow City Soviet Registers New Publication

PM0512143790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Nov 90 Union Edition p 3

[Report by N. Chekhovskaya: "New Moscow City Soviet Publication"]

[Text] No sooner had the brief report appeared fleetingly in an October issue of IZVESTIYA that the Moscow City Soviet Presidium had adopted a decision to organize a new journal VEDOMOSTI MOSSOVETA [MOSCOW CITY SOVIET GAZETTE], than the number of telephone calls to house No. 13 on Tverskaya Street sharply increased. Both Muscovites and inhabitants of other cities were asking how to subscribe to the magazine.

The Moscow Soviet has founded many publications before now. The magazine STOLITSA and the newspaper KURANTY have found a readership. But this is not a whim on the part of the new soviet but a necessity prompted by life. Polls carried out by experts say that voters are interested in how their deputies work. Forget the city opinion polls! Interest in the activity of the Moscow Soviet is high outside the capital as well.

VEDOMOSTI MOSSOVETA is a news publication. Its editor is S. Stankevich, first deputy chairman of Moscow City Soviet. The journal's booklets (they will come out six times a year, priced at two rubles per copy) will mainly be filled with the decisions of the soviet and its presidium on issues of vital importance for the city, material about the activity of permanent commissions, alternative drafts elaborated by the deputies, and publications from Moscow City Soviet's mailbox. Summary tables on the results of roll-call voting will show Muscovites how and for what their deputies voted, and how often they attended session sittings.

The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Information [Ministerstvo pechati i massovoy informatsii RSFSR] has registered the new Moscow City Soviet publication. Recently it was included in the supplement to the catalogue of republic publications, and it has been given the index number 73040.

Subscriptions to the journal are accepted up to 25 December in all departments in the RSFSR... except for Moscow. The city's "Soyuzpechat" management, demanding exorbitant commissions from what is very likely to be a very modest publication, have so far not decided on the questions of subscriptions and distribution. But the problem is being resolved today, and in the next few days Muscovites will also be able to subscribe to the magazine.

Moscow Party Leader Views Future of Communists

AU0612122390 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 2-3 Dec 90 p 5

[Report on interview with Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City Communist Party Committee, by Werner Pirker in Moscow; date not given: "Are We In for 'Democratic Dictatorship?'"]

[Text] In the view of Politburo Member Prokofyev, the Polish "shock therapy" is a solution that is unacceptable for the USSR— "the social break would be too big."

At any rate, unpopular measures—freezing wages, price and monetary reform—would be the price the population has to pay for the introduction of the market economy. Even a Soviet model cannot avoid this, he said.

The head of the Moscow party is in favor of a "social market economy." What bourgeois ideologies find so easy to express is not so undisputed here. Many regard the social element as a rather unnecessary concession to certain "stereotypes in the conscience of the masses." However, what Prokofyev has in mind is rather a mixture of socialism and market economy, a "social market economy," in whatever shape.

The Swedish or Austrian model? Prokofyev argues that "Sweden is not a socialist country in the true sense." Yet, the economic systems of the Western countries have undoubtedly proved that it is possible to have state ownership even under conditions of the market economy. He said that trends toward solidarity and socialism can be observed all over the world today.

A rather wayward view, considering the fact that the current processes seem to point exactly in the opposite direction. After one had to recognize that the worldwide transition from capitalism to socialism failed, Soviet communists now hold the view that we are at the beginning of the age of convergence under socialist domination.

Applied to the USSR, this means above all the demonopolization of ownership, the creation of equal relations between the various forms of ownership. Yet, Yuriy Prokofyev adds that state ownership must dominate.

Moscow's party chief appears to be a convinced supporter of the "socialist choice" (made in 1917) and the communist perspective. This was the consensus of the 28th CPSU Congress. An ideological protective wall against the brute force of the market forces? Or nothing but mere lip service? At least this is the impression that has been increasingly created by the secretary general as of late. This is reflected in the ideological confusion within the CPSU.

Prokofyev has spotted three tendencies. One that is represented by the political center around Gorbachev, and which is guided by the idea of a democratic, human socialism. Second, a social democratic trend, which builds on what is left of the "democratic platform" within the CPSU, and finally, a traditional direction, which clings to outdated "class positions."

The Moscow party organization is said to have strained the relationship with the newly established Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. This applies also to the relations between Yuriy Prokofyev and Ivan Polozkov. The first secretary of Moscow believes that the founding of the Russian Communist Party, which was an absolute necessity in view of the processes toward Republican sovereignty, was taken in too great haste.

This includes also the intention to force upon this party a conservative program which deviates from the course of the CPSU. Yet the communist party of the RSFSR was not established as an independent but as a national group of the CPSU, which is why it is necessarily a member of the CPSU. Now Moscow must bring its influence to bear on the development of the Russian Communist Party in the appropriate degree.

Prokofyev was noted for "spontaneously" calling for an alliance between the central group and those "left of center" against Poloskov in view of the confusion at the founding congress of the Russian party. If interpreted correctly, would this not imply an alliance between Gorbachev and Yeltsin?

Now the chief of the Moscow party says that this is not what he meant. After all, since he opted for capitalism, Yeltsin is a radical right-wing politician. He was thinking of the "democratic platform," Prokofyev argues. Yet, its most popular representative was called Boris Yeltsin at the time. What about the social democratic movement, is it left of center?

In the struggle for food it is completely irrelevant for the consumers whether the supply crisis is a left-wing or right-wing phenomenon. The mafia is not guided by ideological postulates either. In Prokofyev's opinion, the mafia-like conditions are not so much the reason but a consequence of the economic crisis. Because of the imbalance on the market of consumer goods, the mafia has managed to develop its own market structures.

The party's renunciation of power as well as its withdrawal from economic activities have created a vacuum and a deficit in executive power. This finds its expression in the dissatisfaction on the part of the masses, he said. "They do not condemn communism but the party, which has virtually lost its language in civilian life after it handed over control to others."

Will the party find its language again under the changed conditions? Will the Moscow communists find answers to the pressing problems? What is their role in this transition period? Will they have a chance against the mafia, which is waging a predatory war against the people in order to secure itself favorable starting positions in the market economy? Will they have a chance against the political speculators who are in power in Moscow?

As "Moskva Group," the Moscow communists only constitute a small minority in the Moscow City Soviet—91 deputies out of 490. Nevertheless, these are generally recognized people, highly qualified experts. It is thanks to the work of the Communist parliamentary group that the privatization of living space has so far not been adopted in the Moscow City Soviet. It has always been possible to establish alliances, for example with the group of the Christian Democrats, who advocate pluralism of the forms of ownership in the sphere of retail trade.

Moscow City Soviet Deputy Yuriy Prokofyev states that the struggle has taken a new direction. It is now important to initiate processes that increase the people's standard of living and do to not promote the new bourgeoisie's unbridled desire to become rich.

Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov, who is said to be very close to the newly rich, wants to dissolve the oblast Soviets, because they oppose the orders of the new power.

Prokofyev is convinced that, fundamentally, Popov wants the destruction of Soviet power. Nevertheless, it is true that the Soviet system must be reorganized. Equal rights enjoyed by the Soviets at all levels, without a system of subordination would make the effective use of power impossible.

The social revenge of the October Revolution is currently best noticeable in the streets. Street names that recall leaders of the revolution were sacrificed—without any exception—to the nostalgia for the old Russia.

Prokofyev's reaction to this is characterized by mild irony: "they have decided so, but they failed to implement it." They lack the energy and the money to put up new street signs. It is somehow comforting that even the restorative forces are captives of the typical weaknesses of the system.

This does not reduce the danger that is looming over the country, the danger of setting up a right-wing or left-wing dictatorship. How can one protect the democratic processes and prevent the dissolution of the state power? Prokof'yev uses the term "democratic dictatorship" as a possible way out.

Today this means the assumption of executive power by the president in order to protect the most essential condition for a constitutional state, respect for the laws. Yuriy Prokof'yev says that even in this context, the CPSU continues to perceive itself as a party of democratic changes. It wants to cooperate with all those forces that are interested in real democratization.

Prokofyev Interviewed on Market Transition

LD2111224490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Nov 90

[Interview with Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev, Moscow City CPSU Committee first secretary, by correspondent Sergey Omelchenko in the CPSU committee building in Moscow on 20 November—recorded]

[Text] [Omelchenko] Yuriy Anatolyevich, what market do the communists of the Moscow City CPSU Committee stand for?

[Prokofyev] I believe that there is neither a capitalist nor a socialist market. Commodity-money relations cannot be regulated without a market mechanism. I stand for the existence of the market in our country and for the existence of market relations, while preserving collective ownership of the means of production. This is a worldwide tendency, and we must preserve it. Sweeping collectivization was harmful, and sweeping privatization will be just as harmful.

[Omelchenko] Yuriy Anatolyevich, how are the relations between the Moscow City CPSU Committee and the city soviet taking shape with regard to the formation of market relations?

[Prokofyev] I think that they are taking shape in a normal way, though there are distinct differences. The city soviet is more attracted to fuller privatization and set their hopes on private ownership. We believe that the state regulatory mechanism will be more efficient in the present situation.

[Omelchenko] What specific steps are being taken in the direction of developing the market?

[Prokofyev] It is the formation of public opinion; and second, jointly working with the soviets to map out the best plan for moving forward. We believe that the best plan is the introduction of market relations, in the first instance on production; because only by increasing the quantity of goods can we saturate the market, and not by privatization of trade enterprises. If we do not increase production of goods, then it does not matter how hard we privatize trade, the amount of goods will not increase there. The best plan is the formation of a system of budgeting for the city, of a necessary taxing system in the conditions of the market economy. And third, the best plan is privatization to a certain degree in order to patch holes in our beggarly city and union budgets.

[Omelchenko] What commercial activities are being carried out by the Moscow City CPSU Committee? And how is it going to expand them?

[Prokofyev] So far our commercial activities have been insignificant. These are mainly our publishing activities, but we have already set up a joint enterprise, Vsya Moskva [All of Moscow] on the basis of the Moskovskiy Rabochiy publishing house, and that will help us to get hard currency for the expansion of our printing and publishing base. We have a system of hotels and we also hope to generate funds from running it, but in no way do we intend to use these means to keep the apparatus. And the staff of the apparatus must occupy paid positions in it. The means must be spend on the development of the party's material base, and for setting up funds of various kinds.

[Omelchenko] Yuriy Anatolyevich, Muscovites, and not Muscovites alone, are very disturbed by the problem of ration cards. What is your attitude toward it, and in particular to ration cards in Moscow?

[Prokofyev] I have a negative attitude to ration cards, as, first, any such rigid distribution method increases speculation as well as theft, misuse, and corruption at all levels. Second, in order to introduce ration cards, we must have something to back them up with. And third, I think that the market and ration cards are incompatible. If we are going to change over to the market at an ever increasing rate, then we have to give up ration cards.

Moscow Soviet Discusses Housing Privatization

PM2011123390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Viktor Belikov under the rubric "Direct Link": "First Referendum in Capital"]

[Text] Moscow City Soviet—The Moscow City Soviet session, which has resumed after the stormy political events at the end of last week, has heard a proposal from G. Popov to examine the possibility of holding a referendum among the capital's residents during the first 10 days of December.

The chairman of Moscow City Soviet made this proposal in his brief report summing up the first results of the deputies' debate on acute questions of the present situation in the city—the transition to market relations in trade and public catering, the provision of food for the population during the coming winter, and the privatization of housing.

In order to lend greater authority to any possible decisions on these very urgent problems affecting the interests of literally every one of Moscow's 9 million residents, the session must favor one of three options: to assume complete responsibility, to make its clear-cut recommendations to Moscow City Soviet Executive

Committee, or, finally, to submit very important questions to the verdict of Muscovites themselves by means of holding a citywide referendum. It could be made to coincide with the day of the upcoming all-Russian referendum on the new Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Constitution. So, what will the people's deputies of Moscow City Soviet decide? The answer is to be given in the next few days.

Proceeding to an examination of the next item on the agenda, the session set about discussing two alternative privatization projects for the transfer of housing to private ownership. Both documents provide that it will be carried out on a strictly voluntary basis. At the same time they set a definite norm for the living space per person which it is proposed to transfer free of charge. A proportional scale of payments is laid down for amounts above this, which also takes account of the quality of the apartment, the position of the block, and municipal conveniences.

A heated discussion of this question got under way and will continue Tuesday.

Gidaspov Addresses CPSU Leningrad Aktiv

91UN0413A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 90 p 2

["Introductory Statement by B.V. Gidaspov at a Meeting of the CPSU Leningrad Organization Aktiv: For a Soviet Russia As Part of the USSR"; date not given]

[Text] Esteemed comrades!

There is no need to talk particularly about the state of affairs in the country and our Leningrad region. There are greater similarities than differences in the prevailing situation, and unfortunately it can be assessed in only one way, namely, an extraordinarily serious crisis situation. And events are unfolding so rapidly that it takes not months or even weeks but only days for changes in the situation and the reaction though them.

Time is now absolutely of the essence. And today's meeting of the aktiv was prepared in just three days, when usually it requires a longer period. But this speed does not mean that the question has not been worked on in sufficient depth. It has been quietly festering for a long time, and I hope that this review of it will be of some use.

This short interval of time—two or three weeks—has been filled with major political actions that are undoubtedly exerting a decisive influence on everything that will occur in the future.

Without going into other factors, I would like to distinguish three events that are of the greatest importance for the Leningrad party organization and for the country in general.

These are, first, the session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Republic Council at which the draft constitution for the federation and the publication of that document were considered.

Second there is the 15 November RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee plenum.

Finally, there is the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet at which the country's president and CPSU Central Committee general secretary presented a report on the current situation.

It seems to be fundamental to define the position, first and foremost, of the party oblast committee [obkom], and if you agree with it, the position of the Leningrad party organization, on each of these events.

On the subject of the RSFSR Constitution, a detailed analysis of the published document will be presented to you today. Let me make just a few general remarks. The first is that the fact that it was reviewed before debate on the Union treaty and the USSR Constitution might in and of itself seem contradictory. But only at first glance, since the by no means creative but rather destructive thrust of the draft can be clearly and unambiguously traced—toward undermining the unity of the Soviet Union and the very foundations of socialist statehood, and our system. Let me remind you that it does not contain the word "socialism," and the concept of "soviets" has disappeared without trace. It does not contain even a mention of the fact that the Russian Federation is part of the USSR.

Moreover, the integrity of the Russian Federation is really threatened. It is common knowledge that even today Bashkiria, Tataria, Mordovia, Chuvashia, Yakutia, and other autonomous formations have proclaimed their own sovereignty. What will be next? A Middle Ages, a patchwork of individual principalities torn by internecine strife? But a justified desire for national self-determination and preservation of originality, language, and culture are not the same as separatism. Neither history nor our descendants will forgive us for the senseless destruction of a millennium of Russian statehood. All of this is prompting us to define our attitude toward the constitution that has been drafted for the Russian Federation.

The events that took place in the country's Supreme Soviet over a two-day period were stormy and ambiguous. The president's report on the first day was assessed by those present as extremely negative. In fact it did not contain any specific proposals and was made up mostly of declarative statements whose limits of realism would be very difficult to define. That, in particular, is also my opinion.

It is natural following this that sharp criticism was directed toward the speaker, and it hit the target.

The second day of work started with an essentially new report that had clearer contours. The seeming simplicity of its scheme and the dynamic nature of the speech were designed to underscore a firmness of intent. However, the feeling of dissatisfaction remained in the auditorium. The most meaningful part and—the main thing—the lack of guides and mechanisms for realizing the proposals submitted do permit any high assessment of this document. Moreover, there are serious doubts about the possibility of implementing the program within the brief period of 10 days—two weeks—set by the speaker.

Extreme situations also require adequate measures. A year ago we were the first to suggest the need to create vertical structures and strengthen presidential power. Must of us are aware of how that was greeted—hardly with singing and hooting. But soon afterward it acquired a new tone. But what had in practice changed? Nothing! How long can we wait in inactivity?

I totally share the position of USSR People's Deputy A.A. Denisov, who in a VECHERNYAYA LENINGRAD interview published on 19 November this year said: "It is high time to make use of that power."

I know from conversations with communists in the labor collectives and with the secretaries of party organizations at various levels that the position of the Leningrad Obkom and its Bureau and first secretary are also sometimes being perceived negatively. People rightly point out that the numerically large and intellectually powerful Leningrad party organization could be more constructive and express its position more clearly, in a better defined manner than it is now doing.

I must say, not as a correction but as a fact, that this also applies to many other oblast and republic committees. But it is special for Leningraders.

Accordingly, within the framework of today's aktiv meeting and the subsequent debate in the primary party organizations and the mass media, we are obliged to express ourselves more clearly and unambiguously and with a proper sense of responsibility, comparing our position with the present situation in the party and the country.

The Russian Communist Party Central Committee plenum will also be talked about today in a separate report, but as a preliminary I would like to remark that it is undoubtedly a very important event in the life of the CPSU in general. The report of Ivan Kuzmich Polozkov and the statements at the plenum were sharply critical and contained very many important positive elements.

The mass media, however, with the exception of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, passed over this event in rare unanimous silence. I do not think that this position was fortuitous or explained by the rapid concurrence of events. I suggest that it was a deliberate, planned, and worked out action.

There is one more issue that cannot be avoided. This is the matter of the mutual relations between the Leningrad party organization and the party obkom and the Leningrad soviets at all levels.

Up to now we have conducted ourselves in a strictly proper manner, not permitting superfluous criticism. Moreover, wherever it was proper to respond very sharply we have deliberately refrained from open confrontation and have not reacted to the open attacks made both on television and in particular publications, and in statements made by particular deputies from the session rostrums. Even though these attacks were sharp and largely unjustified.

Let me cite just one example. A tendency can be clearly seen to shift all responsibility for what is happening in Leningrad, including the failure of its economy, the interruptions in the supplies of food, and the unsatisfactory preparation of the city for winter, onto certain earlier mistakes by the obkom. Transparent remarks are made about machinations by the present party apparatchiks. Even though we well remember the winters of 1985 and 1986, and subsequent years. I personally do not recall the kind of situation that developed in the fall of 1990 in Leningrad. And it is virtually impossible to explain it in any other way except by the inactivity and irresponsibility of those who have the task of dealing with these matters. I understand the nervous tone of A.A. Sobchak in a television broadcast regarding the situation in our food market. But I must say that his conclusions do not accord with the actual facts.

As previously, I declare that we are not looking for enemies in Leningrad and we are not striving for political, even less civic, confrontation. Even though I have heard many statements to the effect that there can be no kind of consolidation with the CPSU. We have been working, are working, and will be working to stabilize the situation in the city. But we are now longer asking but insisting that this be done jointly and in a coordinated fashion. In the interests of all Leningraders. The party obkom and the other party committees are ready for cooperation at any level.

I appeal personally to Comrades Sobchak and Shchelkanov, Yarov and Koykolaynen, this week or early next week to convene an organized gathering at which matters relating to cooperation and the delineation of spheres and functions can be reviewed.

The strength and capabilities of the Leningrad party organization should not be underestimated. This would be a major political mistake. This cooperation is particularly important now, during the initial and, it must be said, largely unsuccessful stage in the switch to the market and crystallization of the still totally amorphous concept of the free economic zone.

In conclusion let me state the following. I would not like our aktiv to become just many hours of talk. I ask those speaking to formulate their positions clearly and offer specific, businesslike proposals on the matters being discussed, so that our meeting will not last more than two or two-and-a-half hours.

I hope that all participants in the aktiv, first and foremost the secretaries of the oblast committee and rayon party committees, and party obkom and raykom members, will together with the public organizations act as sponsors in setting up in the labor collectives structures that will assume responsibility for stabilizing the economic, social, and political situation at enterprises in industry, agriculture, and transport, and in science, culture, and education.

We must learn to be brief. We must learn to be businesslike.

I thank you for your attention, and I hope for fruitful work.

Leningrad Oblast, City Differ Over Militia Chief

PM2111102990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 90 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Sergey Krayukhin under "Direct Line" rubric: "Appointed by Minister, Dismissed by Leningrad City Soviet"]

[Text] Leningrad—An unprecedented legal situation arose after a Leningrad City Soviet session discussed the question of confirming the chief of the Leningrad Oblispolkom [Oblast Soviet Executive Committee] and Gorispolkom [City Soviet Executive Committee] Internal Affairs Main Administration.

Three contenders were nominated for this post. However, after one of the candidates withdrew, the battle was between G. Voshchinin, the current chief of the Internal Affairs Main Administration, and A. Kramarev, deputy chief of that body's Investigation Administration.

Opinions polarized and a sharp debate broke out during discussion of the two contenders' professional qualities. The main argument against confirming the current chief in the post was his lengthy work in party organs. A. Kramarev was the winner of the ballot, although this does not mean he will automatically take upthe post.

The point is that G. Voshchinin was appointed chief of the Leningrad Oblispolkom and Gorispolkom Internal Affairs Main Administration by order of the USSR minister of internal affairs 15 May 1989 and was confirmed by a decision of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies in April this year. Leningrad City Soviet's decision goes against these resolutions.

At a briefing at the Internal Affairs Main Administration I put the following question to G. Voshchinin:

"What do you make of the situation—doesn't it hinder the fight against crime?"

"Under the existing statute I have been appointed to the post by order of the USSR minister of internal affairs and I will be responsible for all the work of Leningrad's militia until an order about my release from Comrade Bakatin or some other instruction arrives."

Two Incumbents Confirmed for Same Leningrad Post

PM1611100790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent N. Volynskiy: "Two for One Post"]

[Text] Leningrad, 14 Nov—Leningrad City Soviet deputies today spent almost half the day in a bitter debate. One of the most important questions for the city was being decided—the confirmation of a chief of the Internal Affairs Main Administration of Leningrad Oblast and City Soviet Executive Committees. Two candidates were considered—G. Voshchinin, the present chief, and A. Kramarev, deputy chief of the investigatory administration.

A particularly heated clash arose over the G. Voshchinin. Many deputies emphasized that despite the fact that he has not worked for long in this post, he has proved himself to be a thoughtful leader, a good organizer, and a skilled politician. Others followed Deputy N. Ivanov, a former investigator in Gdlyan's group, in attacking Voshchinin, mainly for having worked in the past in the Oblast CPSU Committee Administrative Organs Department. As the result of a vote, A. Kramarev was approved.

This could have been considered the end of the show if not for one very fundamental circumstance. The point is that Major General Voshchinin has already been confirmed in his post by a Leningrad Oblast Soviet session. Moreover, he is a member of Leningrad Oblast Soviet Executive Committee... How will the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs behave in this situation?

Gidaspov Holds News Conference 28 Nov

PM3011161190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by A. Ilin: "Aware of People's Concerns; At the CPSU Central Committee Press Center"]

[Text] Will the CPSU be able to reestablish its authority? Do you believe it is even capable of surviving under the new conditions? These were the blunt questions put to B.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Leningrad party oblast committee, by a foreign journalist at a news conference yesterday. The other correspondents, Soviet and foreign, who had gathered at the CPSU Central Committee press center did not mince words either. They were interested in everything about society today—from Leningrad Communists' participation in the solution of the food supply problems of the city on the Neva to the Persian Gulf crisis.

"At this very moment," B.V. Gidaspov said in reply to the first two interrelated questions, "the party is undergoing a real overhaul, cleansing its ranks of people who should not be there in the first place. For example, those who joined for career reasons. People who were dragged into the party to make the figures look good are also leaving. Only through renewal and democratization can the CPSU become the political nucleus it should be in a democratic society."

As for the the role of party organizations in the life of the city and oblast, the Leningrad Communists' leader explained, we cannot stand aloof from people's concerns. We are offering our support and assistance to soviets, and when our proposals are appreciated they are put into practice. Communists are also concerned about the course of conversion at city enterprises employing several hundred thousand working people. B.V. Gidaspov himself worked for many years in the defense complex and knows the problems well.

A question about the attitude toward party organizations' commercial activities was also asked. Activities of this kind are performed, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed, by many political and public associations in various countries, including the church. But one must not confuse party work and the commercial ventures of party organizations and committees. Of course, one must make absolutely sure that norms and rights and morals are unswervingly observed in these activities.

There have been calls recently for the various parties to abandon the political struggle in the current emergency situation. Journalists, naturally, wanted to know the CPSU Central Committee's attitude toward these proposals. Supporting the desire not to fuel conflicts in society, B.V. Gidaspov explained his own position. Total renunciation of political struggle is obviously unrealistic today. But we can and must do all we can to ensure that disputes about ideological matters and the parliamentary struggle are conducted to the proper political standards and society is not torn apart into irreconcilable groups.

Explosion Damages Tomsk Refinery

LD1312181190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Dec 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] A powerful explosion occurred last Sunday [9 December] at the Tomsk petrochemical combine. A large amount of the equipment of a new ethylene and propylene producing factory was destroyed in the resulting fire. The explosion took place during testing and initializing procedures, after the first tons of propylene had been produced. A state commission is investigating the causes of the accident, but experts think that the mishap occurred at the gas fractionation facility following depressurisation of an all-product line. Three people were injured.

In May 1990, a fire at the same plant caused damage estimated at R2.9 million. This time, the damage is more severe and will cost more to repair.

Local Media Hit Over Bashkir Refinery Incident

PM1312163990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2

[Rport by Aleksandr Zinovyev under the "Direct Line" rubric: "But Television Was Too Late..."]

[Text] Ufa—The Bashkir Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic republic committee have expressed condolences to the families of the victims of the explosion at the Novo-Ufimskiy oil refinery.

"The recovery operation at the destroyed facility will involve as many people as the situation requires," M. Usmanov, deputy chairman of the Bashkir SSR Council of Ministers, told me. "We will do all we can to ensure that the installation is producing again in the first quarter of next year."

The disaster revealed yet another problem: The lack of conditions for promptly informing the population about emergencies. It was not until the next morning, 14 hours after the explosion, that the first announcement was made on local radio, and all the time the most fantastic rumors were sweeping the citry.

According to V. Filev, first deputy chairman of Ufa City Soviet Executive Committee and chairman of the city's emergencies commission, he tried to broadcast an announcement about the incident on the evening of 1 December, but he was unable to do so. It was Saturday, and there was no one at the television studio.

For the same reason, the members of the government commission now recall, the announcement of the phenol disaster in the spring was also very late—unsuspecting people were drinking contaminated water.

I do not think it is a question of technical difficulties—not only these, at any rate. The local press sees in this attitude a lack of public spiritedness on the part of the comrades at the television and radio broadcasting committee.

Komi ASSR Forms Joint-Stock Company

LD1312113190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 13 Dec 90

[Text] A joint-stock company, Respublika, has been formed on the initiative of the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] Government. Its goal is to turn the Komi ASSR into a region with highly developed industry for processing natural resources, primarily timber. The country's Timber Industry Ministry, the Soviet-U.S. fund for the support and development of small enterprises, and other organizations are also among its founders. Over 1 million cubic meters of lumber waste is lost in the region annually, and about the same volume of hardwood does not find a market. Their use would allow production of a significant number of consumer goods, while preserving a lot of timber.

The joint-stock company will pay great attention to employing waste-free technologies and to ecological problems. To solve these tasks it is proposed to set up joint enterprises and to attract foreign investments. The company intends to issue two types of shares: one for enterprises and another for individuals.

Karelian Transport Problems Reported

PM0412100990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Minayev: "Scarce Goods in Containers"]

[Text] Karelian ASSR—It is rare now for an adult inhabitant of Karelia to leave the house without taking his passport with him. And not because a curfew has been declared everywhere in the autonomous republic, which announced its sovereignty a few months ago, and patrols check documents at every step. There is another reason. The hope that something will be suddenly be "put out" in the stores makes them put their "little red book" in their pocket, because without the "hammer and sickle book" the salesmen will not let you have a single item of the slightest use.

Yes, the store departments and shelves are empty. But slightly too catastrophically given that according to statistical reports industry and agriculture, if they are underfulfilling the plan, are doing so only by a slight percentage, not in such terrible proportions.

And recently the workers of the Karelian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] together with representatives of the mass media toured the "Roskhoztorg," "Roskulttorg," "Rosobuvtorg," and "Rosgalantereya" bases and railroad stations and sidings. What did they see? The workers themselves have nowhere to sit because of the quantity of accumulated goods. Everything is piled up at the depots, in sidings and passages, the shelves are breaking and cracking under the abundant produce. But at Petrozavodsk and Kutzhima stations themselves at the same time over 2,000 enormous metal containers stand waiting to be unloaded. They contain scarce goods—thousands of types of medicine, shoes, suits, coats, dresses, jackets, blouses, shirts, sports goods, refrigerators, radios, washing powder, shampoo, cosmetics, socks, stockings, panty hose, and... you cannot list it all. Some of the containers containing food and many other goods for which exhausted customers ask daily have been awaiting masters—the trade workers—since August. It is no accident that in Belomorsk thieves discovered them at the station and plundered the state to the tune of 90,000 rubles at once, stealing karakul skins.

The first impression from what you have seen is sabotage, economic subversion, a mafia plot to heat the atmosphere among the people. Actually, so far the public does not describe these facts in any other way. But in fact? It is far more prosaic—this tedious sequence of our ordinary laxity, indifference, and irresponsibility is enough to take your breath away. For instance, Yu. Ivanov, chief of the Petrozavodsk division of the Oktyabrskaya railroad, and L. Podkolzin, leader of the container area, knew several years ago that the cranes necessary for loading and unloading containers were obsolete. Now they are making out as a misfortune, as something unexpected, the fact that two of the three cranes in their possession have had to be urgently written off. How can they say that there are no replacements anywhere, that there is no such equipment in the country. There is, esteemed gentlemen. Of course, it will not drop from the sky if the leaders do not raise a finger to expand the container area, to equip it with means of mechanization, to create normal labor conditions there, to organize work in not one but three shifts, to provide lighting, and set up guards. There is none of that.

"For over 10 years we have been talking of constructing a new container area where not only three to five tonne containers but also 20-tonne containers would be processed, but the problem has remained suspended," says S. Malishevskiy, director of "Roskhoztorg." "We offer shared participation and all kinds of aid to the railroad workers, but they declining everything. There is no headway."

Indeed, talk of creating reliable loading and unloading fronts in Petrozavodsk and other regions of the republic has been raised dozens of times at party committee bureau sessions and at the Karelian Council of Ministers, but there has been no progress. You have to really try people's patience in order, for instance, to assimilate 360,000 rubles at an establishment so necessary to everyone, although the entire container area costs less than 0.5 million. One asks: Are there masters in the republic?

It is not only the railroad workers but also the motor transport workers who take part in the shipment of goods and the organization of trade. How are they operating in this emergency situation? The trading organization leaders for instance are demanding that permanent trucks and drivers be attached to the bases. No way. Total lack of personal responsibility. There is no one to take to task. When contracts for the supply of transport are violated, when trucks do not come for many days to collect goods.

"Surely we can set up a precise conveyor belt between bases and stores, and agree on everything fundamentally?" we asked V. Starkov and V. Boufal, leaders of automotive enterprises. In response, thousands of questions are put forward that they themselves should resolve every day. It is some kind of game to see who will guess the largest number of puzzles while we can see nothing being done, there is flagrant helplessness and apathy.

The trade bases, sitting on the scarce goods, hearing the people's cries, have also not done a lot to fill the store shelves. There is a shortage of fork-lift trucks, depots, and specialists in receiving and sorting goods. Sometimes output is kept back for months and the people suffer as a result.

The following fact also attests to an inability to put matters right. On 12 November a conference of trade and rail and automotive transport workers was held in the Karelian Council of Ministers. Assurances were given there that the commodities blockage would be resolved in the very near future and measures would also be taken for the long term. Two weeks have elapsed and the situation has deteriorated. What is this if not sabotage of their own decisions?

And on 28 November, the same people who two weeks ago took part in the conference in the Karelian Council of Ministers were summoned to the Karelian prosecutor's office. They were told that unless the railroad workers, automotive transport workers, and trade organization leaders set up collaboration between themselves within 10 days, defuse the situation, and send goods to the stores, then they will be put behind bars. V. Bogdanov, the republic's prosecutor, has stated that there are more than enough facts to institute criminal proceedings against them.

Kemerovo Oblast Moves Toward Civil Accord

PM1412093490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Vladimir Lebedev, chairman of Kemerovo Oblast Soviet Commission for the Defense of Glasnost, Analysis of Public Opinion, and Relations With Social Organizations, by correspondent Viktor Kostyukovskiy in Kemerovo, date not given: "Difficult Road to Civil Accord"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA has already reported (No 318), the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has signed an agreement on cooperation with about 30 parties and social and sociopolitical organizations operating on the oblast's territory. Considering that many sociologists are of the opinion that the development of the processes of politicization is progressing somewhat faster in the Kuzbass than in the country "on average," this region's experience in consolidating the various forces and movements could hold tremendous significance for many people.

The soviet's Deputies' Commission for the Defense of Glasnost, Analysis of Public Opinion, and Relations With Social Organizations took the initiative of sponsoring a document entitled "Toward Civil Accord." Our correspondent Viktor Kostyukovskiy spoke to the commission's Chairman Vladimir Lebedev.

[Kostyukovskiy] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, begin by telling us what prompted the members of the commission to put forward the idea for such an agreement.

[Lebedev] It's no secret: New soviets at every level are in the grip of a dangerous and long-drawn-out disease—so-called "power paralysis." Do I really need to remind you of those too familiar instances where decisions have not been carried out—from laws of state and presidential decrees to decisions by settlement soviets? Should we return to the "big stick" of the administrative edict system? I believe that is not only dangerous, but frankly no longer feasible. Right now, society needs consensus in the same way it needs air. If only on those issues where consensus can be achieved. Only the quest for common viewpoints can help the new soviets stand on their own two feet and acquire the capacity to direct social and economic processes; the notorious "ideological war" and the outmoded fear of "waiving one's principles" cannot help here.

[Kostyukovskiy] I happened to be at the first "roundtable" of the oblast soviet. The conversation, as I recall, was difficult, tense, and, in point of fact, came to nothing in the end...

[Lebedev] Yes, the "roundtable" participants warned: Don't expect automatic approval from us for any of the decisions taken by the soviet, we will take a close look at them and ponder their meaning. Well, that is fair enough, and the draft agreement had to be largely rewritten. And incidentally, this was done together with representatives from the parties and movements.

Frankly speaking, I did not expect the talks to go smoothly. Furthermore, G. Golikov, chairman of the Council of Workers' Committees, was absolutely right when, after the first ultimatums, he put forward a proposal: First, before discussing the draft agreement, to exchange views on the situation in the Kuzbass and the country and clarify the attitude toward it and the different viewpoints.

[Kostyukovskiy] In the course of this discussion, as I remember, there were sharp condemnations directed toward the CPSU bodies?

[Lebedev] Moreover, they were at times wholly justified. In recent months, the leadership of the obkom [oblast party committee], in an effort to preserve power practices and cling to the "leading role," seriously complicated the political atmosphere in the Kuzbass and by doing so brought us no closer to consensus but, on the contrary, merely added to the confrontation. The oblast soviet has rejected absolutely the moralistic and patronizing tone used as a weapon by certain party leaders in talks with the soviet deputies, presidium, and chairman.

Of course, there were the inevitable extreme views. V. Fuksman, a representative of the "civil initiative" movement, reacted to them very reasonably. "Our main failing," he said, "is lack of political culture. They used to shout 'Down with DS [Democratic Union],' now they shout 'Down with the CPSU.' To exclude representatives of a real political force from a 'roundtable' is naive and stupid. We must postpone those intellectual games favored by the chairman of the Democratic Union for some future more peaceful era. We must find positions around which we will be united."

[Kostyukovskiy] Yet neither the second not the third meeting produced results. Skeptics doubted whether the agreement would be signed at all. How then have you managed to create a universally acceptable document?

[Lebedev] By trying as far as possible to take account of the interests of society as a whole and of specific parties and movements. Only the DS representatives have failed to sign the agreement, although some of them have spoken out in favor of signing... Everyone who accedes to the agreement is offered ample opportunity to participate in the discussion of draft decisions at oblast soviet sessions, and also to introduce their own drafts at sessions. Representatives of the parties and social organizations can participate on a consultative basis in the work of the soviet's standing commissions and deputies' groups. A permanent consultative council has been set up under the soviet's presidium to publicize viewpoints and seek mutually acceptable decisions.

[Kostyukovskiy] Thus, in fact, the oblast soviet is becoming multiparty.

[Lebedev] Precisely. It is not simply open to all parties, it is becoming a real political arena where it is the broadest mind that gains the upper hand rather than the loudest voice (we have left that stage behind, thank God), a place where intellect, logic, and the wisdom of life will win through. There is no doubt that this will work to the advantage of the voters and of society.

The soviet, too, will benefit enormously. After all, in this way its own social base and support in society broadens, and its authority increases.

[Kostyukovskiy] Vladimir Aleksandrovich, I know that the agreement, although it was signed only recently, has already shown some results. In particular, representatives of the parties and movements participated in an oblast soviet session and put forward their proposals, many of which were taken into consideration. But the question is this. We all read the papers and we know that in other krays and oblasts the situation is very different. Why is it that here in "the rebellious Kuzbass," as the oblast is often referred to now, the first steps along the road to civil accord have successfully been taken.?

[Lebedev] It is the result of that very "rebelliousness," that is last year's strikes and, more importantly, the workers' movement which emerged during those days. The awareness of the need to consolidate did not come to us speculatively, but through our own experience, the ordeal of the strike and the no less difficult post-strike period. It was and continues to be a time of accelerated politicization, realization by the workers of their role in society, and the formation of their political maturity.

It is far from coincidental that the Kuzbass Council of Workers' Committees was the first to put its name to the document "Toward Civil Accord," because it was this very council which played a decisive role in achieving an agreement.

Deutsche Welle Broadcasts Shown in Volgograd

LD0712213790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 7 Dec 90

[Report by Y. Orlov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Regular broadcasts from Cologne by Deutsche Welle, aimed at people of German nationality living in the Volga valley, have begun on Volgograd television.

[Orlov] A half-hour German-language program began on Volgograd television this week. Opening the series of programs, the presenter in Cologne stressed that all the broadcasts would have the same main theme: the creation of a common European home. This requires the building of confidence between people, regardless of the country in which they live. Cultural exchanges, which as we know, know no borders, could be the bridge that makes this possible. The first program screened by Volgograd television was a news review. It includes reports on the celebrations marking the unification of Germany and a festival of TV films in Westphalia. There was a report on the problems of teaching German in Polish schools and a feature on folk songs and folk singers. Soon to come is the screening of a six-part film entitled "Unknown Country," whose main hero is an American journalist who for the first time toured East Germany, formerly called the GDR. About 30,000 Germans currently live in Volgograd Oblast. We watched the first broadcast together with the family of Yakov Aleksandrovich Lorens, who is an engineer. He was the only one who understood fairly well what was being spoken about on the screen. German has, unfortunately, ceased to be the native tongue of his wife and daughter.

[Lorens, Volgograd television viewer] I think these broadcasts are needed very much because Soviet Germans will now have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the lives of their fellow countrymen and to watch broadcasts in their own language.

Tver Peasant Party Branch, New Bank Created

PM2611132790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Igor Ognev: "Bankers Will Help Politicians?"]

[Text] Tver—Two events have taken place in Tver Oblast. At first glance the coincidence in timing looks accidental, but the logic of our times can be traced here.

The first event is that an oblast organization of the Russian Peasant Party has appeared. As is well known, its founders disagree with the position of the All-Union Peasant Union and the Russian Agrarian Union which, in particular, demand that the countryside be sustained with subsidies. The new party does not reject subsidies either, but on the condition that a master plan should first appear in the countryside. Otherwise the funds, as has happened in the past, will vanish into the sand of the old bureaucratic structures.

The second event occurred slightly before the first—the "Msta" commercial bank appeared in Udomlya, a rayon center in the oblast. It was created by various enterprises and organizations of Tver, Novgorod, and Moscow oblasts. The statutory capital was 8 million rubles and the circulating capital is planned at 120 million rubles. The bank accepts deposits from both enterprises and the population without restrictions, on a contract basis.

It looks as though politicians are receiving the financial support that the countryside needs so much. The bank's main function is to restore the center of Russia. It is primarily peasant farms, cooperatives, and small enterprises for processing raw material that will be the subjects of the bankers' attention.

Newsprint Shortage Hits Some Sakhalin Papers

PM2611165990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
22 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent V. Ryabchikov: "Beleaguered Readers"]

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk—For the fifth day running the population of Sakhalin Oblast has been experiencing a real news blackout. It has not received PRAVDA, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, or KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA since 15 November, because the local printing works has stopped printing them. The reason for this is that most banal of reasons nowadays—no paper. Because it had already met its contractual commitments, the Uglegorskiy pulp and paper plant has stopped supplying paper. The result is that more than 130,000 subscribers have been deprived of the opportunity to read the newspapers they need at the very height of crucial events taking place for our country .

How, then, did this clearly absurd situation arise?

At the start of this year the "Sakhalinlesprom" association disputed the state order for newsprint set by the USSR Ministry of the Timber Industry. It claimed that the order was excessive and exceeded the actual potential of the Uglegorskiy plant, which is the sole producer of the product in Sakhalin. The paperworkers' appeal was successful and the state order was reduced by 28.4 million square meters, that is to say, 7 percent.

A kind of chain reaction then set in. Citing the arbitrator's ruling, the plant began reducing its supplies to consumers indiscriminately.

A meeting held with N. Shlyakhov, deputy chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] yielded nothing. It essentially amounted to angry tirades against the publishing house and its Sakhalin representative. The latter was persistently asked why she had not informed the oblispolkom leaders promptly about what happened. Such information was meanwhile conveyed to A. Zamoshch, chairman of a standing commission of the oblast soviet.

There is one very interesting detail in all this unedifying story. SVOBODNYY SAKHALIN, the oblast Soviet newspaper, has been coming out for some months now. It has no paper quota or allocation. However, it is being printed on time. And on paper from the Uglegorskiy pulp and paper plant. How does it get hold of it?

"I don't know," Ye. Demidov, chief of the "Sakhalinlesprom" production department, said frankly. "It bypasses me, it is done on the sly."

As I file this report, readers remain beleaguered. But hope has begun to dawn. The CPSU Obkom has contacted the Uglegorskiy workers directly and explained the situation to them. They, for their part, have promised to come to the assistance of the beleaguered newspapers.

Khanty-Mansiysk Rejects Sovereignty Declaration

91UN0374A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
23 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Interview with Valeriy Churilov, chairman of the Khanty-Mansiysk Okrug Soviet, by Leonid Skoptsov; place and date not given: "Why Khanty-Mansiysk Is Not Taking Part in the 'Sovereignty Parade'"]

[Text] **The new sovereign republics are appearing one after another on the map—Tatarstan, Yamal, Yakutia, Komi, Chukotka.... Against this backdrop the Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug still remains only an okrug, as before, and it appears stable. The country's main export product is located on the land of Khanty and Mansi: This year, of the 540 million tons of oil that Soviet oil workers will recover, at least 300 million tons will have come from here. The value of that oil in current world prices is $75 billion. Thus, political stability in this region is vitally important for the country's fate, and the position of the local organs of power will increasingly impinge on the effectiveness of our domestic and foreign policies.**

Journalist Leonid Skoptsov talks with Valeriy Churilov, chairman of the Khanty-Mansiysk Okrug soviet of people's deputies and people's deputy of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR].

[Skoptsov] Valeriy Andreyevich, a month ago, on 17 October, your neighbors to the north, the people's deputies of the Yamalo- Nenetsk Autonomous Okrug, who are responsible for two-thirds of the national gas recovery, proclaimed the sovereign Yamalo-Nenetsk Republic. During those same days there was also a session of your okrug soviet, but no reports about the birth of yet another sovereign republic followed.

[Churilov] Everyone is permitted to choose his own path. When the people's deputies reach such a crucial decision it means that they have all considered and defined both their tactics and strategy for the development of the okrug.

Of course, we, too, have not been able to avoid the issue. And there are those among us who favor a republic (true, still an autonomous republic), but analysis has shown that it would not be to our advantage to set ourselves against someone and isolate ourselves. For oil is a special commodity, you cannot spread it on your bread instead of butter. The value of oil lies in the fact that it can be exchanged for something else. This means that the prosperity of our electorate depends primarily on whether or not the soviet is able to establish exchange ties to produce a favorable effect in the region. In order to improve the well-being of the inhabitants, more oil must be recovered and it must be better refined.

We must look the truth square in the eyes: Today the deputies cannot do this. For what the okrug has is only the roots of a gigantic oil-and-gas complex. The entire management structure is in Tyumen, while the technological center is in Moscow, and the refineries are located all over the country. Accordingly, all the profits from our oil recovery pass out of the okrug. So that our position as a raw materials appendage and internal colony is an objective reality that no mere declaration can remove. We must focus our efforts on establishing new economic ties, for which we need maximum access to the outside world, while isolationism and attempts to fence ourselves off and take our own piece of the pie alone is fatal. The simple truth is that the broader the market the greater the opportunities for favorable trade.

We shall move ahead by stages. First we must gain economic independence; this alone can guarantee us mastery of full state power on our own territory, and we shall become an equal subject of the Russian federation; then we shall decide what to call our republic—the Yugorsk Republic or Khanty-Mansiysk, for example, or whether we shall remain an okrug.

But we shall be doing that soon. We cannot delay. The Yugorskiy land has no master. It has been so covered with pipelines that the okrug is literally sitting on a powder keg: There are two or three accidents each day and each year up to 1.5 to 2 million tons of oil are spilled on the ground and into the rivers and lakes. The situation is growing worse with every month that passes. The reason is mismanagement by the people working the land, and the soviets they have set up can do nothing.

[Skoptsov] Oil is a main source of hard currency for the country and thus is both the ends and the means in politics. We now have two centers of power in the country—the all-Union and the Russian. What do you think of this balance of power?

[Churilov] We proceed from the premise that oil is national property, and so we shall oppose any attempts, whether from the Union center or the Russian center, to establish despotic control over resources. In reality, the national wealth can be left at the disposal only of those who recover the oil—the enterprises and their labor collectives.

[Skoptsov] But the central government organs hold weighty arguments, like state orders and pricing from above. The state order for oil is almost 100 percent and prices are set, and even if they rise from 23 rubles [R] to R65 a ton it is just ridiculous to think that this has any bearing on the real cost....

[Churilov] You are right: At R65 a ton the oil deficit in the budget will be R700 million. To bring my okrug even to self- financing, the state must acquire oil from our enterprises at a minimum of R125. Otherwise the region that produces the lion's share of the national product will exist on state subsidies.

In a market economy such paradoxes of the planned economy do not occur.

But valuations in rubles in fact mean little. In practice certain natural proportions have been formed in exchange between the oil and gas complex and the state, and we are all well aware of them, both here and in Moscow. The calculations show that next year the state will be assured of only 60 to 65 percent of the volume set by the State Planning Committee as the state order and needed by the national economy. That is, the effective demand from the state as of today. If the central Union organs or the organs in Russian can guarantee more, we shall be only too happy. But we cannot satisfy insolvent demand.

First, without equivalent deliveries of resources we simply cannot do it.

Second, satisfying insolvent demand means fueling inflation and waste in the country.

Third, a state order at the level of 60 percent of recovery (325 million to 350 million tons countrywide) is more than enough to satisfy the needs of defense, the countryside, and the social sphere and to meet all export obligations. All the rest should go to the free energy resource market, and for our 40 percent we should obtain everything we need for development through direct contracts in the market.

I am more than sure that the present shortage of petroleum products in the country is only a seeming shortage. We are recovering more than enough oil. Everyone knows and can see how much energy and fuel is wasted in the country, and how the steam comes out of the city heating lines during the winter. We must stop the waste and let the market be the best medicine against waste.

And since we now have a real opportunity to influence that market, then our dealings with consumers—near and far—will be built on something quite different. We have a real economic interest, one in the other. The president will not have to persuade anyone to be "friendly." The oil that everyone is receiving today in Moscow will be bringing income to us tomorrow, and that is a quite different economic mechanism and different relationship in the country, both between republics and between people.

[Skoptsov] Valeriy Andreyevich, do you not fear that you also will be accused of separatism, economic rather than political?

[Churilov] How can that be! It is very convenient to believe that we in Siberia care less for the interests of Russia and the entire country than the citizens sitting there on Sadovyy Circle.

We simply must not forget that the wealth of the country is measured by the well-being of each individual citizen, just as the development of the country's economy is measured primarily by regional development. Economic growth cannot be built on a foundation of resolutions and declarations, its foundation must be real resources. And here in the okrug we have those resources—oil, coal, timber, furs, the energy of the younger generation—we have all that!

I regard the future of our country and our okrug with optimism. The only thing that can stop us from living well and happily is fear of work—complaining about the system and begging for credit handouts from foreigners is easier than recovering the oil and coal, felling the timber, rearing cattle, and trading with skill and profit. The Siberians, since time immemorial, have never kowtowed to the center or complained, and they are accustomed to doing things for themselves.

And note also that we are not asking for help or favors or privileges of the type endowed by a free economic zone. We shall pay our taxes punctually. The only thing that local authorities are interested in is insuring proper conditions for the work, so that not simply more oil is recovered but that it is done without harming nature even over a long period of time. This will give the soviet authorities an opportunity to assume full responsibility for the improved well-being of our citizens and for the cultural and economic rebirth of the unfortunate peoples of Khanty and Mansi, who have been exploited like colonial peoples.

Cherepovets Rations Additional Food Items

LD0112054390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 1 Dec 90

[Text] Coupons giving the right to acquire a standard amount of products have increased from today among the residents of Cherepovets, the biggest industrial center in Vologda Oblast. Beginning today not only butter, sugar, and sausage products will be distributed according to a coupon system, but also semi-prepared foods containing meats, fats, vegetable oil, cereals, eggs, salt, and matches.

From 1 January, local authorities intend to introduce books bearing consumers' names in Cherepovets.

Tatar Democratic, Front Offices Ransacked

LD0212130290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 2 Dec 90

[Text] The newspaper SOVETSKAYA TATARIYA reports that the offices of the Kazan branch of the Democratic Party of Russia and the People's Front of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, which have been officially registered by the government, were ransacked during the night. The door locks were forced open, furniture damaged and shelving hurled into the basement; party membership cards, archives, money and personal belongings of staff members are missing. A criminal investigation is under way.

Gorno-Altay Communists Back Stabilization

PM0212223790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 30 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Gornyy Altay Communists' Conference"]

[Text] "Having renounced administrative command methods of leadership, the oblast party organization must not be aloof from influencing socioeconomic developments, which is where the people's vital interests lie," the Communists of Gornyy Altay wrote in the resolution of the oblast conference, which concluded its work yesterday.

Delegates heard and discussed the party obkom [oblast committee] report and formulated and ratified their positions and the basic directions of their actions for the next five years. They proposed that RSFSR people's deputies not examine the draft constitution of the Russian Federation until the Union treaty is concluded in order to preserve civic accord. A resolution was adopted in support of the USSR president's proposals on the stabilization of the country's political, economic, and legal life. Primary party organizations were recommended to organize practical work in implementing them.

The leadership of the major oblast party bodies was elected. V.I. Chaptynov, chairman of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, was elected first secretary of Gorno-Altay CPSU Obkom.

Semenov Elected Kaliningrad First Secretary

LD2411161690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 24 Nov 90

[Text] The communists' stance and the main guidelines of the Kaliningrad CPSU oblast organization in the new conditions have been drawn up by participants at the 21st party conference, which ended today. They expressed serious concern at the present state of the sociopolitical situation, which has led to a slump in production, a shortage of goods, and a lowering of the working people's living standard. They support the course toward a transition to the market economy and the formation in the oblast of a free enterprise zone.

The delegates resolutely rejected anticommunism and antisovietism, as well as attempts to denigrate the country's history and Lenin's theoretical legacy and to break up the USSR.

The conference formed an executive and supervision body of the oblast party organization. Semenov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy and member of the Russian Communist Party Central Committee, was reelected first secretary of the CPSU obkom in multi-candidate elections.

Taking part in the conference's work was Melnikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, who also addressed it.

Perm Oblast Conference Ends; Obkom Chief Elected

PM2811141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general headline: "Party Conferences Held"]

[Text] Perm, 24 Nov—The main directions of the Perm Oblast CPSU organization's activity have been discussed at a report-and-election conference, the second stage of which ended today. An action program to stabilize the oblast's economy and prepare for the transition to market relations was adopted.

Ye.N. Chernyshov was elected party oblast committee [obkom] first secretary on a competitive basis. The composition of the obkom and the control commission was also decided.

RSFSR's Adyge Obkom Elects New First Secretary

PM0212224590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general headline: "At Party Forums"]

[Text] Maykop (Krasnodar Kray), 28 Nov—An Adyge Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party Oblast Committee [obkom] conference has ended here. A.A. Dzharimov, former chairman of the oblast soviet, was elected first secretary of Adyge Party Obkom in a contested election. N.P. Silkova, member of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, participated in the conference work.

Three Ballots Needed To Elect Omsk Obkom Chief

PM0512112990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Shpakov: "At the Third Attempt"]

[Text] Omsk, 1 Dec—Events unfolded in a dramatic manner at the oblast party conference during the election of the CPSU obkom [oblast party committee] first secretary. Two of the four candidates on the list—N. Zhuravlev, acting first secretary, and A. Luppov, first secretary of Tara CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee]—were left after the first round. However, neither was able to obtain the requisite majority in the second round. The next day delegates named a new candidate—USSR People's Deputy I. Nazarov, first secretary of Russko-Polyanskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Party Committee]. He was elected Omsk Party Obkom first secretary virtually unanimously.

The conference adopted resolutions "On the Political Moment" and "On an Action Program in Conditions of the Transition to Market Relations in the Country's Economy."

A. Melnikov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the conference's work.

Ponomarev Elected Belgorod First Secretary

PM2111155390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Conferences Held"]

[Text] Belgorod, 16 Nov—The oblast Communists' tasks in implementing the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress were discussed at the Belgorod Oblast report and election party conference, which ended today.

During its work the CPSU Central Committee and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee were criticized for their indecisiveness in resisting the growing wave of anticommunism and attempts to discredit the name of V.I. Lenin and the historic gains of October.

The conference delegates adopted a work program for the oblast party organization in conditions of the transition to a market economy and elected the CPSU Obkom [Oblast Committee], along with the chairman and members of the oblast party organization Control Commission.

A. Ponomarev was elected CPSU Obkom first secretary and holds at the same time the post of chairman of the Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies.

Oblast Soviet Votes Party Leader Out of Chair

PM1411104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Nov 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS Correspondent V. Guskov report: "Remained in Party Post"]

[Text] Kostroma, 12 Nov—An extraordinary session of the oblast soviet was held in Kostroma today. In a secret vote V.I. Toropov, first secretary of the CPSU oblast committee, was released from the post of soviet chairman, which he had also held.

Just the day before the leader of the Kostroma communists' party organization had resolved for himself the dilemma of the separation of posts when he clearly expressed his desire to remain in party work. This was taken into account.

It has been decided that the election of a new chairman of the Kostroma soviet will be held at the next soviet session, an extraordinary session at the end of November.

Far Eastern Oblasts Coordinate Activity

91UN0414A Moscow LESNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Nov 90 p 1

[Article by LESNAYA GAZETA staff correspondent A. Khoroshilov in Khabarovsk: "A Far Eastern Republic?"]

[Text] The final session of the Second Meeting of the Far Eastern Association of the Council of People's Deputies Coordination Council was held with many representatives of domestic and Japanese mass media in attendance. At the meeting, the leaders of Khabarovsk and Maritime Krays, Amur, Magadan, and Kamchatka Oblasts, and Yakutia completed the organizational establishment of the association and developed a strategy of socioeconomic development and the creation of a market infrastructure for the Far East. A draft treaty on the principles of cooperation and a draft statute of the association were adopted. The statute and the treaty will be confirmed at the next meeting on 25 November. At this point, a new economic organization will appear on the periphery of Russia which will defend the common interests of a region within borders approximating those of the former Far Eastern Republic.

The name of the Far Eastern Republic was not mentioned in the Khabarovsk House of Receptions where the meeting was held. However, it was repeated very frequently in the hall of the Vladivostok House of Youth. A meeting of scientist-historians and activists of public organizations was held there at the same time which discussed not only the issues of 70 years ago, but also the problems of restoring this state entity under modern conditions.

Don Cossacks Elect Mikhail Sholokhov as Hetman

PM2311162690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent M. Kryukov under the "From the Scene" rubric: "Cossacks Hold a Council: M.A. Sholokhov's Son, M. Sholokhov, Is Elected Hetman of the Don Cossacks"]

[Text] Rostov-na-Donu—A congress of Don Cossacks was held in Rostov-na-Donu last Saturday and Sunday. Emotions often spilled over. The council of elders often had to defuse passions. But in the end common sense prevailed.

The speakers were unanimous in the view that giving organizational form to the new social and patriotic movement that has grown up in the oblast will play a positive part in the revival of the traditions of the Don Cossacks, will help to restore historical truth about them, will have a beneficial effect on young people's education and the strengthening of the family, and will make it possible to fight more successfully, alongside local soviet and social organizations, to save Grandfather Don and his tributaries.

Many grievances were aired at the congress. Some people even now look askance at the revival of old traditions. This is true primarily of those who have a poor knowledge of Cossack history and have not heard of the Cossacks' feats in battles against the enemies of the Russian state.

The Cossacks knew how to hold onto land. It is well known that M.I. Kutuzov urged us eternally to honor the services of the Don Cossacks in routing Napoleon. Some people would like to represent the Cossack merely as a man with a whip, laying about the workers during rallies and demonstrations. But for some reason they seldom mention those who gave their lives for the revolution. During the Great Patriotic War the Cossacks often watered their horses at foreign rivers. The hooves of the Don horses also clattered along the Berlin highway. The Fifth Guards Don Cavalry Crops covered itself in glory on the battlefields against the fascists.

The new social movement must be protected against distrust from the outset. But there is another factor that cannot be disregarded. People in the grip of personal ambition are adhering to the movement. They have their eye on leadership posts. They sow discord, issue ultimatums, and try to play the political card. They forget that Cossacks today are not the Cossacks of the beginning of the century. Much has changed in that time.

Thus, in 1641, the Cossacks who died at the time of the famous "Azov siege" were buried in a mass grave at the Monastyrskoye landmark near Starocherkassk. But they were not the only ones. It so happened that this was not the final reckoning of Cossacks buried in this place. Land was also given over here to the Cossacks who laid down their lives in the Civil War years. The grave brought Red and White together. Years passed, and in 1941 seamen from a gunboat that was sunk were buried here...

That is how history and time organized things. Such was the Cossacks' lot. And the lot of seamen too. Let us not forget that. Let us not now call for a reckoning of how many Reds and Whites died, to settle scores. Maps were on sale at the congress showing the borders of the former Don Oblast. There is nothing wrong with that. But some hot-heads are already proposing to petition for the territories to be recarved. That is in our own day, when the country is ravaged by interethnic conflicts! What demands are presented to the Cossacks by today's balladeers of autonomy, who have lost their sense of reality? The Cossacks have always lived peacefully with their neighbors. Let us not introduce suspicion and intolerance to that friendship. The rebirth of the Cossack nation is a single river flowing in one direction. No one should seek a road to isolation. Nor should wisdom betray the present generation of Cossacks. This was said by A. Martynov, hetman of the Union of Cossacks of Russia, and other speakers.

Time is precious. Therefore the congress adopted a decision to declare itself a Great Circle to elect the hetman of the Don Cossacks. When the proposal was made to elect the son of the Don Cossack Mikhail Aleksandrovich Sholokhov, author of the great book "Quiet Flows the Don,"—Candidate of Philosophical Sciences Mikhail Sholokhov—the hall erupted in approving cries of "Hear! Hear!"

Potapov Elected Head of Buryat Party Committee

*PM2111155790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report under the general heading: "Conferences Held"]

[Text] Ulan-Ude, 16 Nov—How should Communists from the Buryat republic party organization operate in the rapidly changing sociopolitical situation and to what key problems should they direct their efforts—these and other questions were discussed by participants in the party conference which has ended here.

The conference adopted a resolution on the accountability report, along with a detailed action program for Buryat party members. These documents stress that the republic party organization is an integral part of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party within the framework of a unified CPSU.

As a result of a secret ballot L.V. Potapov was elected first secretary of the Buryat Republic CPSU Committee.

Buryat-Mongol People's Party Constituted

*PM2311123590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Nov 90 Moscow Edition p 2*

[Report by TASS correspondent S. Trofimov: "Constituent Conference"]

[Text] Ulan-Ude, 17 Nov—The constituent conference of the Buryat-Mongol People's Party took place here today. Its statutes, declaration, and resolution were adopted.

The documents point out, in particular, that the Buryat-Mongol People's Party is a parliamentary party opposed to dictatorship and violence, enmity and chauvinism. Its chief aim is the political, economic, and spiritual rebirth of the Buryat-Mongol people and the restoration of a single statehood on the historical territories in the form of a democratic republic.

A decision was adopted to hold the first congress of the new party in Ulan-Ude next March.

Dagestan Faces Complex Sovereignty Issue

*PM2311123190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 20 Nov 90 p 2*

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA special correspondent K. Markaryan: "Dagestan: Should We Secede?"]

[Text] The Second Congress of Dagestan People's Deputies has opened in Makhachkala. A declaration of sovereignty has been voted down for the present.

Many leaders of national and political movements in Dagestan do not want to adopt a declaration of sovereignty.

It has evidently become the custom in Dagestan recently—and in other places too, incidentally—to stage hunger strikes in the squares rather than just ordinary pickets. Why do people have to resort to such extreme measures every time in their search for justice? The answer is clear: The local authorities are incompetent. The efforts of local informal associations often amount to nothing more than replacing one "bad" appanage prince with another—the first secretary of the rayon party committee. Where is the party in all this? Where it always is: in power. The might of party structures in Dagestan has essentially not been weakened at all. This is shown, for example, by the fact that the famous Article 6 of the Dagestan ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution has not yet been abolished.

This means that, as far as the political map of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] is concerned, the temperature remains "below freezing" on the western shore of the Caspian, directly above Azerbaijan—Dagestan, in other words.

But why are the informal associations here so weak, and why did they lose in the elections to the republic's

Supreme Soviet at the beginning of the year—elections which were held under the absolute power of one party and sometimes violated the law, incidentally? It all comes down to disunity. There are some 30 different indigenous peoples living in Dagestan. Consequently the authorities are doing their utmost to suppress the politicization of the mountain peoples that has now begun, while turning a blind eye to their national movements. As long as the Kumyk are wrapped up in Kumyk affairs and the Lak in Lak affairs, for example, the incumbent leaders are not under any threat.

"No Dagestani with any common sense would demand our republic's total economic separation from the RSFSR with the economic conditions and political structures as they now stand," Z. Abdullayev, leader of the emerging Dagestan People's Front, believes. "It would be suicide. So, essentially, political sovereignty is the only possible subject for discussion..."

I do not think it is hard to guess what this could mean. Laws adopted by the RSFSR Government will be left to the tender mercies of the present Dagestan leadership. Progressive laws which undermine the one-party monopoly no longer get through here, as we can see. But what about the rest?

The composition of the Dagestan Supreme Soviet is interesting in this respect. Of its 56 deputies, 36 are leaders of party committees, soviet and trade union organizations, and the Komsomol [All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League]. There are also senior officials from the Dagestan Council of Ministers and the Dagestan Supreme Soviet Presidium. The remainder include three state farm directors, two directors of major enterprises, and two rectors of higher education establishments. In the whole parliament there are only two professional lawyers and no (!) economists, to say nothing of the absence of young deputies. The system has managed to leave its mark on many of these people. I have no doubt about this when I think of today's new democrats who have come to power in many republics. Far from all of them have resisted the temptations of its unchanged structures. So what can we expect from those who have been in these power structures for years? But let us return to the sovereignty issue and attempt to predict the possible course of events.

So, let us suppose that sovereignty is achieved. Will Dagestan's considerable number of social and ethnic problems disappear? I think that is a rhetorical question. On the contrary, they will only get worse. An enormous amount of "groundwork" has already been laid for this. The Avar, for example, living in Georgia's Kvarelskiy Rayon, have their problems, and the Chechen-Akkin removed from Dagestan's Aukhovskiy Rayon in 1944 at the will of "the father of the peoples" have theirs. Whereas the former want to live where their forefathers lie, the latter are unintentionally forcing the Lak to feel constricted—while they, in their turn, have been resettled in the land of the Chechen. The Kumyk have other demands: Stop the resettlement of the mountain peoples in the "Kumyk" plain, resolve the question of territorial autonomy—more than 20 tasks in all. And what about the divided Lezgin living in southern Dagestan and northern Azerbaijan? Or the Nogai, half of whom live in Stavropol?

I would not like to think that ethnic discord is possible in Dagestan. The history of this region does not know examples of internecine dissension. On the contrary, the freedom-loving mountain peoples have always united to defend their independence.

What is going to happen then? Are we going to cut ourselves off from Russia with the now fashionable political screen and thereby prolong the agony of the old system? Or are we going to try to avoid the interethnic conflict that follows this agony by choosing the common road leading to a market economy and new political and economic relations? There is no other option, as they say.

Volgograd Foreign Currency Speculators Tried

PM2311113790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 90 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Trial of Foreign Currency Speculators]

[Text] Volgograd—Articles of jewelry, money, antiques, and video and audio equipment worth over half a million rubles, as well as $14,000 was confiscated by KGB workers from the group of foreign currency speculators whose trial has begun in the oblast court. During the investigation, which lasted for over six months, an extensive network of links between the foreign currency speculators and Soviet citizens in other cities and foreign students and specialists was revealed.

Crimean Tatars Resettlement Committee Formed

LD2211131790 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 22 Nov 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Lev Ryabchikov]

[Text] Simferopol November 22 TASS—A committee for the affairs of deported peoples was formed at the Crimean Regional Executive Committee. It deals with all issues related to organising the return of Crimean Tatars to their homeland. The latter were evicted from their ancestral land on false charges of treason.

Yuriy Osmanov, a 49-year-old engineer, is the committee chairman. He served two terms in camps for involvement in the national movement of the Crimean Tatars and spent two years in a "special psychiatric hospital".

The committee has a ten-member staff. Specialists in construction, agriculture, planning and finances work in the department engaged in the distribution and use of resources—materials and funds allocated by the state for organising the return of Crimean Tatars. A special customer service is being set up to solve all issues related to designing and building housing for re- settlers and social welfare facilities.

Another sub-division of the committee—the department for the organisation of the exit and settlement of Crimean Tatars—is engaged in elaborating a procedure for the people's return. On its staff are activists in the national movement and experienced organisers.

"Early this year, we distributed a questionnaire in Fergana, Kuban and Kherson regions and other areas where Crimean Tatars live," Osmanov says. "We have learnt in which of the Crimean areas they would like to move and when. The potential of each Crimean city and village and prospects for their development are also studied."

Osmanov notes that the committee is only beginning its work, but its members have already taken part in settling conflicts in Yalta and Yevpatoriya. The committee staff believes that it is all- important to prevent such conflicts from erupting in future. Local authorities hold the same view.

New Noginsk Paper Reflects 'Democratic' Views

LD2111153790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 21 Nov 90

[Text] Residents of Noginsk, near Moscow, have with interest acquainted themselves with the first editions of the newspaper DOSTOINSTVO. The publishers of the newspaper assert that their creation expresses the view of the democratic public and all strata of the population, irrespective of political parties, mass movements, other organizations, or individuals.

Noginsk is the first city in the capital's oblast where three local publications have started to come out at the same time.

Tyumen Oblast Soviet Proceedings

LD1311231890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Nov 90

[Text] The Tyumen Oblast Soviet met today. Its participants spoke in favor of consolidation. They decided to ask the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet to reject the request concerning the recognition of the Yamal-Nenets republic. Instead of forming such a state within the state, it has been suggested that principles of economic relations between various regions should be elaborated and that they should be established among local soviets at all levels.

The concept of the oblast's transition to market relations was adopted at the session. It was agreed that priority should be given to the development of agrarian and industrial complexes. Deputies are planning to adopt a categorical address, as they call it. It is not yet known to whom it will be addressed, whether the country's or republic's parliament, or the USSR president. But the issue raised will be the urgent tasks faced by the oil and gas industry of western Siberia.

Deputies Urge Rejecting Yamalo-Nenetsk Okrug

PM2711154590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Yu. Perepletkin: "Deputies Were Categorical"]

[Text] Tyumen—Of the 207 deputies in the hall for the oblast soviet session, 199 voted against recognizing the republic into which the Yamalo-Nenetsk Autonomous Okrug was recently transformed.

After a detailed study of the matter, it was ascertained that the decision of the okrug soviet (IZVESTIYA has already reported it) runs counter to a number of articles in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Constitution.

The deputies emphasized that, taken separately, the parts of the artificially dismembered oil and gas complex (the Yamalo-Nenetsk and Khanty-Mansiysk Okrugs and the oblast's southern rayons) largely lose their economic significance. The "full sovereignty" of autonomies, which looks tempting at first sight, actually leads to the collapse of the country's largest fuel and energy base. In addition, and this is particularly important, it essentially gives nothing to the indigenous ethnic groups, although it was to them that the initiators of the creation of the Yamalo-Nenetsk Republic referred.

The session proposed to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet the rejection of the northerners' request for recognition of the new republic.

Dispute Over Stavropol Newspaper Registration

PM2111154990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 90 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by correspondent Valeriy Oliyanchuk: "Infringement of Glasnost"]

[Text] Stavropol—Rayon newspapers' editorial boards are being deprived of the right to be cofounders of their own papers.

Believing in the Law on the Press and conforming to the latest government acts, some local newspaper editorial boards in the kray tried to perform the role of cofounders of their newspapers on an equal footing with soviets and CPSU committees, but, having been sharply rebuffed by potential partners, they have abandoned the idea. Incidentally, aside from the labor collective of the Kochubeyevskiy Rayon paper ZVEZDA PRIKUBANYA, they are all very popular in the region. [sentence as published] The editorial board wants its own way, putting forward as a serious argument the profitability of the publication, material backing from sponsors—a number of powerful kolkhozes and the

"Stavropol" association of farms held by tenants or owners, set up with its assistance.

But the rayon soviet presidium and rayon executive committee, under the influence of the CPSU Raykom [Rayon Committee], dragged their feet on registration of the paper and have now made their final decision: The right to be cofounder is refused and henceforth the "editor will not be elected, but appointed." One can easily read between the lines of both written refusals: There must be no innovations or departures from the old principles. The rayon paper's creative collective sees this as an infringement of glasnost. B. Kuchmayev, deputy chief of the Kray Administration of Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade, agrees with its view, considering the rayon authorities' decision to be wrong. "It was made for one purpose only," he said. "To restrict journalists' independent initiative and to continue to command the paper as a raykom and rayon soviet organ."

Novaya Zemlya Island Soviet To Be Restored

LD1111113490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 11 Nov 90

[Text] It has been decided to restore the island soviet of people's deputies on the Arctic archipelago of Novaya Zemlya. The territory, where the nuclear test range is situated, lies within the borders of the Arkhangelskaya Oblast.

The permanent Novaya Zemlya island soviet was created in 1924. Reindeer breeders, hunters, and fishermen lived there. In the 1950's, with the beginning of military construction on the islands, the German population of Novaya Zemlya were resettled on the mainland, away from the land that had been theirs from time immemorial.

Today, not only the military inhabit the archipelago; experts and researchers and their families are also there. The interests of the development of the region are not at present taken account of anywhere on the islands. Essentially, that huge territory—and the archipelago covers around 83,000 square km—is excluded from economic activity.

The island soviet is called on to restore the principles of the sovereignty of the people of Novaya Zemlya. A special working group of the oblast soviet has been formed to organize it.

Business Publication Founded in Nakhodka

LD2811161790 Moscow TASS in English 1400 GMT 28 Nov 90

[Summary] The first issue of BUSINESS NAKHODKA [DELOVAYA NAKHODKA] was published today in the Far Eastern port of Nakhodka—the center of the free economic zone that is being set up there.

Report on Volgograd Cable Television System

LD2711160990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 27 Nov 90

[Report by correspondent Ye. Orlov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An unusual technical installation appeared recently at the highest point of the river port station, part of the premises of which is rented by the Volgograd leisure center. [video shows satellite dishes] These are satellite antennae which receive the programs of foreign television companies from space. Here at the center they record them on a video recorder and then pick out the most interesting and topical programs and translate them into Russian.

Besides this, the new television studio has at its disposal a selection of both the best Soviet and foreign feature and documentary films, which can be watched uninterrupted for more than 2,000 hours.

And finally there is the output created by its own creative personnel—city news, recordings of festivals, concerts, theatrical performances, coverage of the life of the local soviets and many other things. A total of 362 people—journalists, producers, cameramen, artists, presenters, technical service personnel—all of these make up Volgograd cable television which, at present, has no equal in the country among similar services.

The picture is broadcast to the city's apartments by means of optical fiber communication lines. The installation of the equipment in an apartment costs the subscriber R77. The charge for using the channel is R15 a month. You can judge for yourself whether that is an expensive pleasure or not. The cost to watch each video is approximately 6.5 kopecks.

Cable TV Network Established in Bryansk

PM2611150590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 90 Second Edition p 1

[Item from roundup of PRAVDA, TASS, and INTERFAX reports prepared by A. Batygin under the general heading: "Telephone, Teletype, Telefax"]

[Text] Bryansk—For the first time in the oblast, a cable television system has been commissioned in one of the city's districts. So far the residents of two large apartment blocks have gotten this opportunity. They will soon be joined by 25 more.

Zaslavskiy Soviet Chairmanship Criticized

91UN0456B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 9 Dec 90 p 1

[Letter signed by Yu. Belkin, V. Sidorov, A. Melnikov, N. Pogosov, M. Ryzhov and other people's deputies for Moscow's Oktyabirskiy Rayon Soviet (in all 35 signatures): "Pocket Democracy: Will Rayon Soviet Chairman I. Zaslavskiy Resign?"]

[Text] **For about half a year now, particularly since we elected USSR People's Deputy I. Zaslavskiy chairman of the Oktyabrskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies, many statements concerning our rayon have appeared in the mass media—in newspapers and journals and on radio and television. As a rule they belong to one person—the chairman of the rayon soviet. Stinting no word of eloquence he generously promises the voters in the territory under his charge that "a real mechanism of popular power will be put into operation" and that "an economic zone with maximum freedom" will be created, and that he is concerned for the disabled and people with low income and will improve the lives of people in the rayon. It would seem that these eloquent words should be followed up with real deeds. Alas, time has shown that the reassuring promises have merely remained on paper. What we have here is obvious self- advertising.**

Quite recently, in the newspaper VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA for 30 July this year, I. Zaslavskiy asserted the following: "A normally operating mechanism has been created for the activity of the soviet, and it has been possible to select and rally people." Four months have passed and in the list just published and signed by the rayon soviet chairman and being circulated today in the rayon, we read something quite different: Many deputies are being accused of deliberate sabotage, and it is proposed that the inhabitants demand from them "an accounting for what has happened," and it is stated that it is planned to make "changes in the power structure" in the rayon in the spring of 1991. In other words, setting himself against the corps of deputies, the chairman of the rayon soviet is proposing nothing more nor less than dismissing the deputies and giving preference to a "regime of strong power."

What is happening here? What has made I. Zaslavskiy change his position so sharply and talk in such a hostile way about his own colleagues? The fact of the matter is that during our joint work in the rayon soviet we have grown wiser, matured, gained experience, learned how to distinguish the true from the false. We have learned everyone's worth. Including I. Zaslavskiy's. We have seen his true face. In our work in the rayon soviet we have encountered phenomena that even the day before we could not have foreseen. It is precisely this circumstance that has pushed our colleague—the chairman of the rayon soviet—out of equilibrium. Dear readers, we wanted to share with you the observations that we have made and only now understand.

We have been witnesses to astonishing facts. An analysis of those facts confirms the desire to get rid of the one-man command in the corps of deputies, the one-man command of a single person—his, Zaslavskiy's—in the rayon soviet, along with the small group of deputies that he finds convenient and obliging, whom he has recommended for the soviet presidium and who have been forced to serve not so much the lawful authorities but rather himself personally, enticed by high salaries.

But even this is not the most terrible thing.

Under the leadership of I. Zaslavskiy monopoly structures are being organized, as similar as two peas in a pod to the classic "shadow" formations that we know of from numerous publications. Judge for yourselves: Both the chairman of the rayon soviet and the chairman of the executive committee, and almost all their deputies, have become leaders in the rayon authorities and are simultaneously also the leaders of cooperatives, commercial banks, and companies: The "Miloseriye i Kultura," which is engaged in show business, is headed by I. Zaslavskiy. The "Firit" Information Center, which occupies offices in the rayon executive committee premises, is commanded by executive committee member Yu. Fogelson. Another member of the executive committee—Sh. Kakabadze—is the director of the "Assistant" Consulting Office. The chairman of the rayon executive committee, G. Vasilyev, the deputy chairman, K. Stesyakov, and the chief of the community property administration, Yu. Gusev, are members of the board of the "Gradostroitelnyy Tsentr" company. D. Shusterman, who has just been named by I. Zaslavskiy as chairman of the Export Council, is in charge of the "Ya, Ty, My" and "Pyatyerka" cooperatives. The chairman of the Commission of Deputies on Physical Culture and Sport, S. Maksyuta, is the manager of the "Sportkom" company. Exceptionally favorable conditions are being created for the activity of all these companies, and tens of thousands of rubles of financial resources are being transferred from the executive committee's main budget fund; that is, they are openly robbing you and me of funds earmarked for the socioeconomic development of the rayon. Can such a thing be tolerated?! Is it possible that under the convenient cloak of being workers in the organs of power, entrepreneurs and merchants have reached with impunity into the state's pockets and squandered the rayon's resources?

All of this is taking place with the protection, approval, and personal involvement of I. Zaslavskiy, who has chosen the workers in the rayon soviet presidium and the executive committee and approved for them a program that is in line with his idea of the concept of the "market economy and the financial independence of the rayon."

We must speak honestly about the state of affairs in the rayon.

The vegetable harvesting and procurement campaign in the rayon was virtually ruined by the executive committee and the rayon soviet. Had it not been for the help of the USSR Council of Ministers, which purchased and imported potatoes from Poland and Germany and delivered them to all the rayons of Moscow, including Oktyabrskiy Rayon, the winter would have been hard for the inhabitants.

The housing program for the rayon is doomed to failure. However, the rayon executive committee did start to sell off apartments to the inhabitants, primarily those who decided to leave the country and go abroad. These people make no secret of the fact that their intention to buy back the apartments is mainly so that they can resell it for hard currency or lease it to a foreign company. This is at a time when within the rayon more than 60,000 people are living in communal quarters and today have almost no chance of improving their living conditions.

Crime is growing catastrophically in the rayon. At the same time the Committee To Fight Crime, led by the chairman of the executive committee, did no work from May through September. The plans of the rayon soviet to set up a municipal militia still remains just a smug promise.

There is uncontrolled registration of commercial enterprises and public organizations, whether or not the rayon needs them, and here, communications between the rayon executive committee and the rayon soviet and state enterprises making a significant contribution to the capital's economy is essentially good.

But there is virtually no communication between the chairman of the rayon soviet himself, I. Zaslavskiy, and his deputies. The door to his office is tightly closed, not only against the inhabitants of the rayon but also against many of the deputies. It is opened only for the select few, the specially chosen aides to the chairman. The boss of that office has divided people up into those who are suitable and those who are not. Those with whom he curries favor and those to whom he speaks with a sneer. For some he raises salaries to the level of professors and, to make up for that, others are constantly given the cold shoulder. Trips abroad are for obliging colleagues, and all kinds of brakes are applied to the work of independent deputies who are prepared to assume the burden of the decisions that have been reached and respect the rights of the voters and their own rights, and who speak out against usurpation of those rights.

Constant confrontation with people who have their own position, intrigue, head-on collisions, intolerance of different thinking, the artificial division of the corps of deputies into blocs and factions and the accusations of sabotage in the work of the session and of the rayon soviet and executive committee—such is the style of I. Zaslavskiy's "legislative" activity. This means, of course, that there can be no agreement, for there is no business. It is impossible to do anything in policy or in the economy in the atmosphere of discord. Only people united by a common cause can make the rayon soviet and the session capable of work, only through common intent can the situation in Oktyabrskiy Rayon be changed and everything possible be done to make life in it tomorrow at least a little better than it is today.

It grieves us to write this, but we must. At a time when the inhabitants of the rayon stand for hours in enormous lines for essential products, the apparatus of the executive committee and the rayon soviet are being issued something long forgotten—crab and caviar. There are more things from the "delicatessen." The rayon soviet chairman, I. Zaslavskiy, has taken advantage of his position to buy a "Volga" car, which he has housed in the warm executive committee garage while he continues to use an official car. This is while those who took part in the Great Patriotic War have been dreaming for decades of sitting behind the wheel of their own car...

But there must be limits to everything. Even members of the rayon Society for the Disabled, which had nominated him for the post of people's deputy, and who just yesterday were voting with both hands for their candidate, have today been forced to ask a far from simple question on the pages of the newspaper VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA: "Is this the man who became a people's deputy?! Could it be that perhaps Comrade I. Zaslavskiy used the disabled as a stepping stone on his way up?"

The divergence of words and deeds, the brazen political maneuvering, the inability and the reluctance to unite and rally people and support their good initiatives and direct their efforts toward finding solutions to the specific problems in the rayon—all this has eloquently revealed what can and cannot be expected of the chairman of the rayon soviet and his team, and has demonstrated the impossibility of realizing any kind of program of vital importance to the rayon. No, it is not the progressive deputies who are prepared to devote all their efforts and knowledge to the rayon's socioeconomic development who are to blame for the fact that the session today is slipping and that valuable time and money are being lost on it. The reason lies elsewhere. It lies in the enlightened deputies' refusal to accept a bankrupt leader who has made something real into a ringing phrase that is in fact a mere empty husk. Each of us could once again be persuaded that no one needs babbling democrats. The logical outcome of this activity has been the results of the vote to find support for I. Zaslavskiy's appeal to the inhabitants of the rayon. It was supported by only 14 of the 97 deputies present. Thus, it was, as it were, a vote of no confidence in the chairman of the rayon soviet. It was only the absence of some of deputies from the session that prevented a final decision to retire him.

We have lived for many years with myths. But today, on the threshold of the major and inevitable changes in the life of our society, when the country is being sucked increasingly into crisis, it is impossible to remain silent any longer. In these days, silence is criminal. We are obliged to tell people the truth. And so, in the hope of your understanding and support, we decided to write this letter to the newspaper.

Time is counting off inexorably the days allocated to us for good deeds. It insistently asks us this: What have you managed to do for people during this period? Time is demanding an answer. We are ready to pay the bill.

[Signed] Yu. Belkin, V. Sidorov, A. Melnikov, N. Pogosov, M. Ryzhov and other people's deputies for Moscow's Oktyabirskiy Rayon Soviet. (In all 35 signatures.)

Omsk Paper 'Flirting With Extremists'

PM1312152190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Yu. Shpakov: "In Sympathy With Whom?"]

[Text] Omsk—The weekly bulletin of Omsk City Soviet, which is now published by the editorial board of the newspaper VECHERNIY OMSK, carried an extensive interview, covering almost a whole page, with Valeriya Novodvorskaya, a well-known figure in the "Democratic Union." The feature was given a pretentious title—"I Will Fight Dragons." Although the editorial board made the bashful proviso that the positions of the newspaper and its authors might not coincide and even referred here to the authority of Voltaire, it is not hard to see for yourself that the journalist A. Korshunov is manifestly in sympathy with his interviewee.

Yet just three days earlier that same evening paper had carried notes by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent N. Kutorgin which spoke of an act of political hooliganism perpetrated in the city by Novodvorskaya. A handful of "Democratic Union" supporters had held an unsanctioned rally near the Lenin monument, during which the guest had directed a savage stream of abuse against the leaders of the country and the republic, not fastidious in her expressions or bothering about proof. The few participants in that gathering were themselves probably somewhat shocked at the statements that "civil war is not that terrible," that "Yeltsin is a hypocrite," that "Russian legislators have grabbed cozy jobs and rich pickings," etc. Then some 20 youths marched through the streets carrying tricolor flags and extremist slogans, including this one: "Down with Soviet power!" At the center of the small group was Novodvorskaya, holding a banner inscribed "Down with the fascist clique of Gorbachev and company!"

A natural question arises: Does a newspaper which calls itself a soviet publication need to popularize someone who openly calls for the overthrow of the state system, ostentatiously commits punishable offenses, and, in addition, is under investigation? What is this—political blindness or lack of discrimination in the search for "original" topics?

The present weekly will soon become the independent newspaper NOVOYE OBOZRENIYE [NEW REVIEW], and the city soviet is its cofounder. It is possible to understand the young collective's desire to attract the city public's attention with striking and unusual articles and to find its own identity more quickly. It is succeeding in this to a certain extent. It is all the more annoying to see attempts to gain prestige by dubious means—by flirting with unbridled extremists.